

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION**

**CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN**

***REPORT #4***

**TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

**on**

**June 30, 2000**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 1. Letter from CDE Director of Special Education, Dr. Alice Parker.**
- 2. Introduction Report # 4: Documentation for “CDE’s Corrective Action Plan for the Findings in the Office of Special Education Programs’ 1996 and 1999 California Monitoring Reports,” (February 25, 2000.)**
- A. Overall Supervision and Monitoring System Identifies and Corrects Noncompliance**
  - 1. CDE assurance that systemic noncompliance is consistently identified and corrected through the Integration of Quality Assurance Components. Selected districts:**
    - Sweetwater Union High School District
    - San Diego Unified School District
    - Lynwood Unified School District
    - Antelope Valley Union High School District
    - Fremont Unified School District
    - W. Contra Costa Unified School District
    - Garden Grove Unified School District
    - Modesto Elementary School District
    - Norwalk La Mirada Unified School District
  - 2. CDE has Conducted Verification Reviews 1999-2000**
    - 18 Randomly Selected Reviews Conducted
    - 8 Facilitated Reviews Initiated
    - 11 Collaborative Reviews Initiated
  - 3. CDE has Consistently and Effectively Implemented a Systematic Process**
    - To determine whether districts have corrected and prevented the reoccurrence of noncompliance; and
    - Ensuring that children receive needed services.
- B. CDE Monitoring and Supervision of FedCAP Districts Found Noncompliant by OSEP Monitoring Reports in 1996 and 1999. Selected districts:**
  - Fairfield Suisun Unified School District
  - Mt. Diablo Unified School District
  - Holtville Unified School District
  - Los Angeles Unified School District
  - San Francisco Unified School District
  - Saddleback Valley Unified School District
- C. Noncompliance in Public Agencies with Long-standing Systemic Noncompliance. Selected districts:**
  - Santa Barbara Elementary School District
  - Oakland Unified School District
  - Sacramento Unified School District
  - Compton Unified School District
- D. CDE Enforcement/Sanction Actions Ensure Compliance When Other Actions Have Not Ensured Compliance**

June 30, 2000

Ruth Ryder, Director  
U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services  
Division of Monitoring and State Improvement Planning  
330 C Street, S.W.  
Switzer Bldg. Room 3609  
Washington, D.C. 20202-2500

Dear Ms. Ryder,

Pursuant to the February 25, 2000 Corrective Action Plan, the California Department of Education (CDE) submits this final report to document how CDE is fulfilling its responsibilities to supervise and monitor compliance of local education agencies (LEA) with IDEA '97 through the Quality Assurance Process (QAP).

## **SECTION A**

Section A provides documentation of CDE's overall supervision and monitoring system that identifies and corrects noncompliance. CDE has integrated all components of the QAP: local plans, focused monitoring, Coordinated Compliance Reviews, complaint management, and hearing decisions. Through CASEMIS and the verification review process, CDE has collected and analyzed student level data submitted by LEAs to determine whether these LEAs have corrected and prevented the recurrence of non-compliance and have provided requisite services to students with disabilities.

This section provides documentation for each of the 9 selected districts. Further, there is documentation of completed verification reviews for the 18 randomly selected districts from the Coordinated Compliance Review, 8 facilitated districts and 11 collaborative districts. CDE also provides student level information self reported and submitted by LEAs to CDE regarding services to students with disabilities.

## **SECTION B**

Similar to Section A, section provides documentation of CDE's overall supervision and monitoring system to ensure that FedCAP districts are in compliance in the areas identified by OSEP in the 1996 and 1999 California Monitoring Reports. CDE has utilized the QAP for all 15 FedCAP districts. Through CASEMIS and the verification review process, CDE has collected and analyzed student level data submitted by LEAs to determine whether these LEAs have corrected and prevented the recurrence of non-compliance and have provided requisite services to students with disabilities.

As required, this section provides documentation of the 6 selected FedCAP districts.

### **SECTION C**

This section provides documentation of CDE's overall supervision and monitoring system to ensure that districts with long-standing noncompliance are in compliance with the areas identified by OSEP in the 1996 and 1999 California Monitoring Reports. CDE has utilized the QAP for the 4 selected districts. Through CASEMIS and the verification review process, CDE has collected and analyzed student level data submitted by LEAs to determine whether each of these 4 selected districts has corrected and prevented the recurrence of non-compliance and has provided requisite services to students with disabilities.

As required, documentation is provided on the 4 selected districts.

### **SECTION D**

This section provides documentation regarding CDE's enforcement actions to ensure compliance by LEAs with IDEA '97. This section provides a description of each enforcement action, date, impact/outcome, and the status of any further corrective action agreed to or required.

In summary, I am pleased to provide this comprehensive final report to you as it demonstrates the effectiveness of CDE's overall supervision and monitoring system and continuous commitment to California students with disabilities and their families and the positive outcomes they deserve. I wish to thank you and your colleagues for your ongoing cooperation and assistance throughout this transition year as CDE improves the fulfillment of our supervision and monitoring responsibilities and efforts for improved student results.

Sincerely,

Alice D. Parker Ed.D.  
Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Director, Special Education Division

ADP: GK:gk

Cc: Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Scott Hill, Chief Deputy Superintendent for Accountability and Instruction  
Leslie Fausset, Chief Deputy, Superintendent of Policy and Programs  
Henry Der, Superintendent, Educational Equity and Access Branch

**“CDE’s Corrective Action Plan for Findings in the Office of Special Education  
Programs’ 1996 and 1999 California Monitoring Reports”**

**Report #4-Documentation**

**June 30, 2000**

**Introduction**

As a State Education Agency (SEA), the California Department of Education (CDE) recognizes and implements its responsibility to establish and maintain a system of statewide Local Education Agency (LEA) compliance so that the education rights of students with disabilities are protected while improving results for these children. Federal and state laws require CDE to monitor LEA activities in providing eligible students with a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE). These laws also call on CDE to enforce and monitor corrective action by LEAs that are not in compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA '97) or fail to carry out their responsibilities.

CDE fulfills its responsibilities to supervise and monitor LEA compliance with IDEA '97 through the integration of the core components of the Quality Assurance Process (QAP). These components include the review and analysis of local plans, focused monitoring, coordinated compliance reviews, complaints management, and hearing decisions. CDE conducts compliance verification process reviews that utilizes the QAP and answers 4 questions:

1. Are the data the district reports to the state consistent with information found in student records (CASEMIS)?
2. Does a review of student records indicate that the district is in compliance with state and federal special education laws and regulations?
3. Are selected students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) implemented as written (as evidenced by record review, parent/staff interviews)?
4. Has the district corrected prior noncompliance items so that they do not reoccur?

This report details the progress by CDE's ability to achieve the required results, as specified in Sections A, B, C, and D of the February 25, 2000 Corrective Action Plan (CAP). As it discusses CDE activities related to each section of the CAP, this report provides documentation and evidence, including corrective actions, to demonstrate CDE's SEA responsibilities for identification, correction, monitoring and enforcement to ensure compliance with IDEA '97

<p><b>A. Overall Supervision and Monitoring System Identifies and Corrects Noncompliance</b></p>
--

**The California Department of Education (CDE) will demonstrate that it:**

- 1. Has integrated all components of the Quality Assurance Process (including local plan review, focused monitoring, Coordinated Compliance Reviews, Complaint Management, data review and analysis, and hearing decisions) and ensures that systemic noncompliance is consistently identified and corrected;**
- 2. Has, during the 1999-2000 school year, conducted at least 18 randomly selected verification reviews, and initiated at least 8 facilitated and 13 collaborative reviews; and**
- 3. Has consistently and effectively implemented a systemic process to determine whether districts have corrected and prevented the recurrence of noncompliance, including ensuring that children receive needed services.**

CDE has completed the required reviews of LEAs during the months of March through June. Therefore, this report provides final information on the 9 selected districts cited in Section A of the CAP. Information demonstrates how CDE implements the QAP to ensure LEA correction and prevention of the recurrence of non-compliance including ensuring that children receive needed services. The 9 LEAs and type of LEA for review include:

- Sweetwater Union High School District (Verification review from the CCR pool)
- San Diego Unified School District (FedCAP district)
- Lynwood Unified School District (Verification review from the CCR pool)
- Antelope Valley Union High School District (Facilitated district)
- Fremont Unified School District (Verification review from the CCR pool)
- W. Contra Costa Unified School District (Collaborative district)
- Garden Grove Unified School District (Verification review from the CCR pool)
- Modesto Elementary School District (Collaborative district)
- Norwalk La Mirada Unified School District (Verification review from the CCR pool)

**A. 1. CDE will demonstrate that it has integrated all components of the QAP and ensures that systemic noncompliance is consistently identified and corrected. QAP components include:**

- Local Plan
- Focused Monitoring
- Coordinated Compliance Review
- Complaint Management
- Hearing decisions; and
- Verification Reviews
- CASEMIS data (as requested by OSEP May 5, 2000)

**A. 2. CDE will demonstrate that it:**

**Has, during the 1999-2000 school year, conducted at least 18 randomly selected verification reviews, and initiated 8 facilitated and 11 collaborative reviews**

CDE reports for this June 30, 2000 report completion of verification process reviews for 18 districts randomly selected from the CCR pool; 8 facilitated districts; and 11 collaborative districts. Dates of review completion are listed below.

<b>18 Randomly Selected</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Review Dates</b>
Poway Unified School District	Completed	March 8-10, 2000
Escondido Union Elementary School District	Completed	March 15-17, 2000
Alameda Unified School District	Completed	March 27-29, 2000
McKinleyville Union Elementary School District	Completed	March 28-29, 2000
Garden Grove Unified School District	Completed	March 29-30, 2000
Santa Cruz City High School District	Completed	March 30-31, 2000
Lynwood Unified School District	Completed	April 10-12, 2000
Alisal Union Elementary School District	Completed	April 11-12, 2000
Salinas City Elementary School District	Completed	April 13-14, 2000
Fremont Unified School District	Completed	April 17-18, 2000
Chula Vista Elementary School District	Completed	April 24-28, 2000
Sweetwater Union High School District	Completed	May 3-4, 2000
Norwalk LaMirada Unified School District	Completed	May 9-11, 2000
ABC Unified School District	Completed	May 16-18, 2000
Lowell Joint Elementary School District	Completed	May 17-18, 2000
San Juan Unified School District	Completed	May 22-24, 2000
Encinitas Union Elementary School District	Completed	May 22-24, 2000
Pajaro Valley Joint Elementary School District	Completed	May 30-31, 2000
<b>8 Facilitated Reviews</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Review Date(s)</b>
Hayward Unified School District	Completed	March 28-30, 2000
Palo Verde Unified School District	Completed	April 4-5, 2000
Greenfield Union Elementary School District	Completed	April 6-7, 2000
Alum Rock Elementary	Completed	April 12-13, 2000
Pittsburg Unified School District	Completed	May 9,10,15, 2000
Centinella Valley Unified School District	Completed	June 1-2, 2000
Antelope Valley Union High School District	Completed	June 5-6, 2000
Brawley Union High School District	Completed	June 8-9, 2000
<b>11 Collaborative Reviews</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Review Date(s)</b>
West Contra Costa Unified School District	Completed	March 8,13,23, 2000
San Diego Unified School District	Completed	March 20-21, 2000
North Sacramento Elementary School District	Completed	March 27, 2000
Mendota Unified School District	Completed	March 30-31, 2000
San Francisco Unified School District	Completed	April 5-7, 2000

Los Angeles Unified School District (Hamilton/Palisades)	Completed	April 6-7, 2000
William S. Hart Union High School District	Completed	April 18-19, 2000
Redlands Unified School District	Completed	April 20-21, 2000
Perris Union High School District	Completed	May 16-17, 2000
Modesto City Elementary School District	Completed	May 23-25, 2000
San Ysidro Elementary School District	Completed	June 26-28, 2000

**A. 3. The California Department of Education will demonstrate that it has consistently and effectively implemented a systematic process to determine whether districts have corrected and prevented the reoccurrence of noncompliance and ensuring that children receive needed services**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides documentation for the following 9 selected districts:**

1. Sweetwater Union High School District (Verification)
2. San Diego City Unified School District (Collaborative District & FedCAP District)
3. Lynwood Unified School District (Verification)
4. Antelope Valley Union High School District (Facilitated District)
5. Fremont Unified School District (Verification)
6. West Contra Costa Unified School District (Collaborative District)
7. Garden Grove Unified School District (Verification)
8. Modesto City Elementary School District (Collaborative District)
9. Norwalk-LaMirada Unified School District (Verification)

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides documentation regarding its efforts to identify and correct noncompliance. CDE provides individual district compliance profiles and Corrective Action Plans that include the required documentation as stated in February 25, 2000 CAP. Documentation includes:**

- a. A detailed summary of the finding(s) made through the Quality Assurance Process and the date of the finding(s);
- b. The required corrective actions, including specific activities and timelines;
- c. A detailed summary of any and all prior finding(s) of noncompliance with the same requirements in that public agency;
- d. The current status of the corrective action(s) and of compliance, including whether children are receiving needed services and any evidence from parents that corrective action has occurred; and
- e. The specific additional actions that CDE has taken or will take, including, but not limited to, follow-up data collection, technical assistance, and sanctions, to secure compliance/correction, and the date on which CDE took or by which CDE will take each such action.



<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>OAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None 5 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Compliant	None 6 NC Resolved	1996
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Compliant	None 14 NC Resolved	3/17/00
<b>Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Compliant	None 6NC Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-	None	1998-99

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on May 3-4, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/3-4/00
7.0	All students who are evaluated for an initial or three year reevaluation do not receive a hearing and vision screening unless parental permission is denied.	
9.0	Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
10.0	The evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum	
12.2	There is no statement of validity of the evaluation reported.	
12.3	Evaluation reports do not include a statement that the tests used for each child's evaluation are valid for the intended purpose.	
12.4	Evaluation reports do not include a statement related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.	
15.0	Three year reevaluations are not completed on time.	
20.5	IEPs do not include program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable students to succeed in the general education classroom.	
20.6	IEPs do not include a statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.	
20.7	IEPs do not include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.	
24.1	The annual IEP review did not include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum.	
29.2	Record reviews shows that the general education teacher is not included in the IEP meeting.	
78.4	The district's notification does not provide a description of each evaluation procedure, test, record or report the district used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.	

## **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance**

### **History: Verification Review Process**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 5/3-4/00**

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are no reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. CCR self-review findings were found compliant by CDE as of 3/17/00.

Timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99. Though reported as self-corrected as of June 15, 2000, CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

<p><b>CCR District Self-Review Noncompliant Findings (Submitted to CDE July 1, 1999)</b></p>
--

Item	Findings	Status: Compliant	Date(s) 3/17/00
1	The district does not identify all students, 0-21, including private school students in need of special education		
2	The district does not use a systematic process for referring potential students for special education evaluation that is coordinated at the school site level		
13	Parents are not provided a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination		
20	The district does not develop an IEP for each child within 50 days of parent consent to the evaluation unless the parent agrees, in writing, to an extension		
29.2.1	The general education teacher does not participate in development of the IEP including the determination of		
29.2.1a.b.c.	...the appropriate positive behavior interventions and supplementary services and program modifications		
35.5.1	For students age 16 or younger, if appropriate, the IEP does not describe a coordinated set of transition activities that are designed within an outcome-oriented process.		

35.5.2 For students age 16 or younger, if appropriate, the IEP does not describe a coordinated set of transition activities that are reviewed annually.

80.13.a,c,d,e,f,g

The procedural safeguards notice does not contain information about attorneys fees, including the fact that: the court in its discretion may award reasonable attorney fees if the parent of a child with a disability is the prevailing party; the court finds that the parent unreasonably delayed the final resolution; reasonable attorney fees may also be awarded following the conclusion of the administrative hearing with the agreement of the parties; the hourly attorney's fees rate exceeds the prevailing rate in the community for similar services by attorneys of reasonably comparable skill, reputation, and experience; if the time spent and legal services provided were excessive; if the attorney did not provide to the school district the appropriate information in the due process complaint; reduction of attorney's fees will not apply if the court finds that the state or school district unreasonably protracted the final resolution of the action or proceeding or there was a violation of the IDEA procedural safeguards.

80.14 The district's document explaining the procedural safeguards do not contain information about attorney's fees not awarded, related to any meeting and as a result of a due process hearing proceeding or judicial action.

80.17 The district's document explaining the procedural safeguards do not contain information about school discipline and placement procedures for students with disabilities.

80.17 a-f The district's document explaining the procedural safeguards do not contain information about school discipline and placement procedures for students with disabilities including the fact that: prior to the child exceeding 10 days in an alternative setting for suspension, an IEP meeting must be held to determine if the child's misconduct is caused by the disability; this IEP meeting must take place immediately, if possible, but on or before 10 days of the school district's decision to take this type of disciplinary action; the child's parent is invited to participate as a member of the IEP team; the school district may be required to develop an assessment plan to address the misconduct, or if the child has a behavior intervention plan, review and modify the plan as necessary; if the IEP team concludes that the misconduct was NOT a manifestation of the child's disability, the school district must provide the parents with the notice of procedural safeguards and may take disciplinary action, such as expulsion, in the same manner as it would for children without disabilities; the parent disagrees with the IEP team's decision, they can request a due process hearing from CDE's Special Education Hearing Office.

80.18 a-c The district's document explaining the procedural safeguards do not contain information about alternative interim educational settings including the school district may suspend or place in other alternative interim settings a student with disabilities to the same extent these option would be used for children without disabilities; the school district must continue to provide special education and services (free appropriate public education) and may not place a student in an alternative setting for longer than 10 days unless by court order or parent consent for any children suspended over 10 days; provided that there was parental consent or a court order, alternative settings allow the child to continue to participate in the general curriculum and ensure continuation of services and modifications detailed in the IEP.

80.23a.4a The district's document explaining the procedural safeguards do not contain information about how payment may not be reduced or denied for children attending private schools under the following circumstances: ...the district must notify the parent about this requirement.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

### **Findings**

**Date(s)**5/3-4/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. Specific services reviewed for selected students included occupational therapy, speech language and hearing, and special education services provided for students in special education day classes. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of service provider logs
- Review of staff attendance time sheets
- Review of student attendance time sheets
- Student/staff observations in the classroom
- Interviews with Program Specialists, school psychologists, counselors, case carriers, teacher of students with severe disabilities, 1-to-1 student aide, Adaptive Physical Education teacher, bilingual Special Day Class teacher, Assistive Technology Specialist, and special education administrators
- Interviews with some students

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation. IEPs are implemented as written.

**Sweetwater Union High School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

Compliance Area for Students:	Number of Students	District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance
Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)	0	See narrative below
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	0	See narrative below
Not receiving needed transition services	0	
Not receiving needed related services Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

Upon receiving CDE's CASEMIS list of students with past due IEPs, "As of 6/15/00, 2:10 P.M. we (*Sweetwater Union High School District*) finished our last IEP to bring out district into total compliance. The original list sent to us on June 2, 2000 now has the revised, correct dates for both IEPs and 3 year reevaluations. The revised dates have been entered into our Management Information System and will be ready for transmittal to you (CDE) via CASEMIS in the morning (6/16/00) after 9:00 A.M. ...I will be sending a hard copy in addition to the electronic transmission. Our team of psychologists, therapists, teachers, administrators and clerical staff rallied to the cause and exhibited a team spirit never seen in our district or department. As everyone set to work to verify the data and correct non-compliant files, it was clear to me (Director,

Special Education) that this group of dedicated, motivated individuals was not going to settle for anything less than perfect. Indeed that goal of “perfect” has come true.....**No students are out of compliance.**

We want to thank you (*FMTA S Administrator, Bob Evans*), and Alice Parker, for raising the standards. Without the latest challenge we would have never know how great our staff really is and we would have never really known how qualitatively different our district is when compared to others. Our district is truly serving students and parents in an exceptional way and with great integrity. We also know how to keep our district in compliance and have put in place the reorganization necessary to transmit accurate information to the state.”

Angela M. Hawkins, Ed.D.  
Director Special Education

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Sweetwater Union HSD	3, 856	3, 276	580	15.0%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Sweetwater Union HSD	3, 856	3, 187	669	17.3%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required		None required	Compliant
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	14 NC Identified 1999, 14 NC Resolved and cleared by CDE 3/17/00		None required	Compliant 3/17/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	<b>(as of 6/30/00)</b> 5 NC Resolved		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluations</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 1. Review and correct data 2. Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> 1. Review and correct data for identified students 2. Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review-Student Records Topic</b>  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (Vision and hearing screening)</b>	<b>Item #</b>  7.0	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00



		<p>administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures.</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Signed evaluation plan resulting in an IEP within 50 days)	9.0	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within fifty days of obtaining written parental consent to an evaluation;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the timelines for completing IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information to enable child to be involved in and progress in the general education)	10.0	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to evaluation how the child's disability affects their ability to be involved and progress in the general curriculum;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (validity) & <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (valid for intended	12.2 12.3	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and</p>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00

purposes)		<p>staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)	12.4	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Parents are provided a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination)	13.0	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility determination;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of eligibility determination.</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (3 year)	15.0	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and</p>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00

<p><b>IEP</b> (Program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable students to succeed in the general education classroom.)</p>	20.5	<p>administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.)</p>	20.7	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>		Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum)</p>	24.1	<p><b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> </ol>	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00

<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher in the IEP)	29.2	3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00  <b>Sweetwater Union HSD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the participation of general education teachers in the IEP; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	Review of required evidence and possible parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
	78.4	<b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to provision of prior written notice to parents; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00		Noncompliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Verification Review-Annual IEPs</b>	<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements		See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99

<b>Reevaluation</b>	See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements		Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Related Services</b> <b>OT</b> <b>PT</b> <b>SLH</b> <b>Counseling</b> <b>Other</b>	-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Transition</b>	-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>	-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 5/3-4/00
<b>Students-long term suspension Expulsions</b>	-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 5/3-4/00

***CDE Monitor: B.J. Hernandez, Consultant Telephone:916/327-4215, email:bjhernandez@cde.ca.gov  
FAX: 916/327-5233, Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814***

## District Compliance Profile

### SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS

<i>QAP Findings</i>	<i>Date(s)</i>	<i>Current Status</i>	<i>Required Corrective Actions</i>	<i>Date(s)</i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-21 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Compliant	None-19 NC Resolved	11/16/99
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Noncompliant	18 NC under CDE Review	6/30/00
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	105 NC Resolved, 3 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	0 Decisions/orders	none	1999

#### CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS

Conducted by CDE on March 20-21, 2000

For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school) **Note: Bolded items indicate OSEP identified areas of noncompliance in its California Monitoring Reports of 1996 and 1998)**

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)** 3/20-21/00

#### **A review of records indicates that:**

- 4.0 LEA does not provide parents with a written notice that their child is being considered for special education referral.
- 5.0 LEA does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.
- 7.0 All students who are evaluated for an initial or three year reevaluation do not receive a hearing and vision screening unless parental permission is denied.
- 8.4 LEA does not provide evaluations that are performed in all areas related to suspected disability by a multidisciplinary team.
- 9.0 Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.
- 10.0 The evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum
- 12.1 LEA is not providing qualified personnel to administer tests in the child's primary language.
- 12.4 There is no statement of validity of the evaluation reported.
- 12.5 Evaluation reports do not include a state that the tests used for each child's evaluation are valid for the intended purpose.
- 12.8 Evaluation reports do not include a determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 15.0 Three year reevaluations are not completed on time.
- 20.1 The statement of present levels of performance in the IEP do not include a description of how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum.
- 20.2 IEPs do not include measurable annual goals.

- 20.3 Review of IEPs indicate that there is no direct relation between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the education services to be provided and the students goals and benchmarks.
- 20.4 Students IEPs do not include information showing a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the educational services to be provided and the student's goals and benchmarks.
- 20.8 IEPs do not include program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable students to succeed in the general education classroom.
- 20.9 The IEPs do not always include an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extracurricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.10 IEPs do not include a statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.
- 20.11 IEPs do not include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.
- 24.1 The annual IEP review did not include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum.
- 24.2 The district does not always complete the annual review IEPs on time.
- 29.3 A preponderance of evidence through record reviews shows that the general education teacher is not included in the IEP meeting.
- 33.1 District records show that there is no description of activities to integrate the pupil into the regular education program.
- 33.2 The district failed to provide a description of the activities provided to support the transition of children from the special education program into the regular education program.
- 34.0 Records show that the district not meeting IEP requirements related to transition (items 34.0 through 36.0)
- 41.0 For students whose behavior impedes his/her learning or that of others, the IEP team has not considered positive behavior intervention strategies and supports.
- 45.1 For children with learning disabilities, IEP's do no include a statement that the disability is not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.



- 77.0 Written notices that include all of the required contents are not consistently provided to parents of children with disabilities (77.0 through 78.7)
- 79.0 The records show that parents are not routinely given the procedural safeguards.
- 87.0 The district does not complete IEPs by the child's third birthday for children transitioning from IDEA Part C.
- 89.0 A regular education teacher is not included on the preschool age child's IEP team if the child is or may be participating in a regular education environment.
- 117.1.0 IFSP reviews do not include information about the degree to which progress toward achieving outcomes is being made.
- 122.2.0 A review of infant/toddler records shows that the service coordinator is not always included in the IFSP review.
- 123.2 A review of infant/toddler records shows that vision is not always evaluated.
- 123.5.1 A review of infant/toddler records show that the intensity of service is missing on some IFSPs.
- 123.5.4 A review of infant/toddler records shows that there is not appropriate justification for service not being provided in the natural environment.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

<b>Item Findings</b>	<b>Date(s) 3/20-21/00</b>
----------------------	---------------------------

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. These areas are listed below.

- 9.0 Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.
- 15. LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial). CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

- 20.3 Students IEPs do not include information showing a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the educational services to be provided and the student's goals and benchmarks.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.
- 45.1 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify that the disability is not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP does not include information regarding observation of any relevant behavior of the student in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment made by one team member other than the child's teacher.

*\* = noncompliance confirmed by CASEMIS data and verification review process*

**CCR District Self-Review Noncompliant Findings**  
**(Submitted to CDE July 1, 1999)**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>*Status:</b> To be determined	<b>Date(s)</b> 6/30/00
-------------	-----------------	----------------------------------	------------------------

**(\*Note: District provided CCR Self Review to CDE with partial evidence 6/12/00 (one school site). Other evidence is due to CDE. Evidence under review as of 6/30/00)**

As items are submitted to CDE, CDE will log, track, monitor and verify areas self-identified by San Diego Unified School District for noncompliance correction and maintenance. This includes examining data from previous CDE monitoring activities as well as other data collection methods (prior CCRs, compliance complaints) include the April 2000 verification review to determine LEA correction of CDE identified noncompliant findings. CDE is currently following up on self review information not submitted from several schools sites.

## **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)** 3/20-4/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were selected by CDE and extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. Specific services including counseling, occupation therapy, speech and language therapy, adaptive physical education, special education programs/services delivered by students placed in Special Day Classes and Resource Specialists Programs were selected. The verification review of student records also focused on compliance/noncompliance of students receiving supplementary aids and services.

The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- On site visits to preschool, elementary, middle school and secondary school sites/programs
- Review of staff service logs
- Review of staff time sheets
- Student/staff observations on site
- In person and telephone interviews with parents
- In person interviews with speech therapists, occupational therapists, adaptive PE specialists, SDC and RSP teachers
- In person interview with school site principals

### **FINDINGS**

1. Of the students selected, several parents expressed positive satisfaction with their child's special education program and services and that those services were provided as stated on the IEP.
2. One parent expressed that she wanted more services for her child who was deaf/hard of hearing. She stated that the IEP is implemented as written currently.
3. Observations of staff and students combined with various record review and interviews, provide evidence that for the student selected, IEPs are implemented as written with special education and related services provided..
4. Several staff members stated that school sites are allocated a certain amount of money annually for special education services and that it is up to each school site to determine how that money will be spent. As a result of site decision making, some students may not receive services as stated on their IEP (Example: speech and language therapy).

**CONCLUSION:** For selected students, no noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation for selected students. CDE will follow up on staff interview information regarding site based decision-making and services to students with disabilities.

**San Diego City Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	3296	<p>2468 (75%) of these students had IEPs due this spring. The data entry of current IEP information has not yet been completed for the end of the school year. The number of overdue IEP meeting will be accurately reported in the June 30, 2000 CASEMIS End of Year report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Schools were reminded via memo (attachment 1 provided to CDE) to submit copies of IEPs in a timely manner for data entry.</li> </ul> <p>Full implementation of the on-line IEP system in January, 2001 will eliminate the data entry backlog and provide “real-time” data.</p>
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	1393	<p>825 (59%) of these students had IEP meetings due this spring (see explanation above).</p> <p>482 (35%) of these students had current IEPs but the date of the triennial review was reported as overdue. A sampling of these IEPs reveal that in some instances the case manager misunderstood the date that was to be reported on the IEP form, and the data entry was not accurate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Case managers will be notified in writing regarding the accurate completion of IEP forms</li> <li>▪ Data entry staff will be trained to make corrections to data when entering in the database.</li> <li>▪ Record review and data entry corrections will be made before the submission of the June 30, 2000 CASEMIS report.</li> </ul> <p>Full implementation of the on-line IEP will eliminate data entry errors through programmed warning notices in the data base.</p>
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	1	Program manager working with case manager to ensure provision of services
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b> <b>Occupational therapy</b> <b>Physical therapy</b> <b>Speech and language therapy</b> <b>Counseling</b> <b>Other(s)</b>	Total: 20  0  14  0  6  0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In process of contracting additional services from non-public agencies and mental health providers</li> <li>▪ Program managers in process of re-developing caseloads of service providers</li> </ul>
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)</b>	0	

Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	2	Two students are waiting for NPS placements. Referrals have been sent to NPS, student not enrolled in school. Other student awaiting NPS placements are receiving “stay put” services.

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
San Diego USD	15, 140	14, 399	741	4.9%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
San Diego USD	15, 140	13, 485	1, 655	10.9%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1992, 1996 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1992, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –18 NC CDE Continued follow up/monitor 6/30/00 Partial evidence rec'd 6/12/000 from the District. CDE reviewing currently with follow up to obtain further self-review evidence from district		1999 18 NC CDE follow up Monitor	Noncompliant 1999-6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 105 NC Resolved, 3 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students		1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	Annual Reviews 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students		Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>		
	4.0	<b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports included all required contents; Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

(written notice of referral to parents)		Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation plan within 15 days)	5.0	<b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation than contains all of the required contents. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Vision and hearing screening)	7.0	<b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 5. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening; 6. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 7. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures. 8. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation in all areas of suspected disability by multidisciplinary team)	8.4	<b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to using a multidisciplinary team to conduct evaluations in all areas related to suspected disability; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the use of a multidisciplinary team to conduct evaluations in all areas related to the suspected disability. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been,	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Signed evaluation plan resulting in an IEP within 50 days)  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information to enable child to be involved in and progress in the general education)  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Qualified staff to administer tests in child's primary language)	9.0	<p>evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within fifty days of obtaining written parental consent to an evaluation;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the timelines for completing IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
	10.0	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to evaluation how the child's disability affects their ability to be involved and progress in the general curriculum;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
	12.1	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00



<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (validity)</b>	12.2	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (valid for intended purposes)</b>	12.3	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (determination of effects of environment, cultural, or economic disadvantage)</b>	12.8	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of required evidence due 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>Evaluation (3 year)</b>	15.0	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state</li> </ol>	CDE review of	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

			evidence 9/30/00	
		<p>federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>		
<b>IEP</b> (present levels of performance including description of how the disability affects the child's involvement in the general curriculum)	20.1	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (annual goals)	20.2	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (direct relationship between present levels of performance, any	20.3	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

evaluations and the education services to be provided and the students goals and benchmarks)		<p>participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	9/30/00	
<b>IEP</b> (a statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services to be provided to the child or on behalf of the child)	20.4	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (Program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable students to succeed in the general education classroom.)	20.5	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (Explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisbled children in the regular class and extracurricular and nonacademic activities.)	20.6	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

<p><b>IEP</b> (Statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.)</p>	20.7	<p>administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether their child will take district or statewide achievement tests.)</p>	20.8	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum)</p>	24.1	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

<p><b>IEP</b> (complete annual reviews on time)</p>	24.2	<p>information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher in the IEP)</p>	29.2	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the participation of general education teachers in the IEP;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (A description of the activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education program indicating the nature of each activity, and the time spent on the activity each day or week)</p>	33.1	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to supporting the transition of students from special classes and centers and from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

<b>IEP</b> (Description of activities to integrate the special education student into the regular education program)	33.2	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have transferred from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian schools to the general education classroom in the public school, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
	34.0 35.0 36.0	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to transition for students age 14, including IEPs that contains goals and benchmarks that focus on the transition needs of the student in his/her course of study such as advanced placement courses or vocational education. Including...</li> </ol> <p>For students 16 years or younger, if appropriate, an IEP with a coordinated set of activities that are designed with an outcome oriented process, reviewed annually, promote movement from school to post-school activities, including post-secondary education, vocational training, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living and community participation; are based on the student's needs, preferences and interests; include statements of needs transition services with an explanation each area in which services were NOT recommended regarding instruction, related services, Community experiences, development of employment, post-school adult and living objectives, and if appropriate, daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation</p> <p>Interagency responsibilities or any needed linkages to implement transition activities;</p> <p>When a participating agency other than the district fails to provide the transition services stated in student's IEPs, how the district reconvenes the IEP team to identify alternative strategies to meet the transition objectives for students.</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

<p><b>IEP</b> (Positive behavior intervention strategies)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (For students with SLD, statement that the disability is not the result of vision, hearing, motor impairment or emotional disturbance)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (For students with SLD, IEPs certify that observations of the student's behavior have been made by a team member other than the child's teacher)</p>	41.0	<p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to transition; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to behavior intervention plans; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to behavior intervention plans; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been identified as having serious emotional disturbance, specific learning disabilities, or who have a behavior intervention plan included in their IEP along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
	45.1	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with learning disabilities; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00
	45.2	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 3/20-21/00

<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written Notice Requirements)	77.0 to 78.7	<p>administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with learning disabilities;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to provision of prior written notice to parents;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/20-21/00</p>
<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written Notice Requirements)	79.0	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to providing the parents with a document describing the procedural safeguards available to the parents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to providing the parents with a document describing the procedural safeguards available to the parents;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/20-21/00</p>
<b>IEP- Preschool</b> (Completion prior to child’s third birthday )	87.0	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to developing and implementing the IEP for children who are transitioning from early intervention services under IDEA, Part C;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to developing and implementing the IEP for children who are transitioning from early intervention services under IDEA, Part C;</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/20-21/00</p>



<b>IEP- Preschool</b> (Including a regular education teacher in the IEP if the child is or may be participating in a regular education environment )	89.0	<p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have transitioned from early intervention services under Part C to special education preschool services under Part B, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students, age three to five years, who have had an IEP since May 2000, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/20-21/00</p>
<b>IFSP-IDEA Part C</b> (Information about the degree to which progress toward achieving outcomes is being made)	117.1	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews);</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews);</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students, birth to three years of age, who have had an IFSP developed or reviewed since May 2000, along with contract information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/20-21/00</p>
<b>IFSP-IDEA Part C</b> (Include service coordinator in the IFSP)	122.2	<p><b>San Diego City USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews);</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews);</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/20-21/00</p>



		reviews); 4. Provide CDE with a list of students, birth to three years of age, who have had an IFSP developed or reviewed since May 2000, along with contract information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Verification Review-</b>  <b>Annual IEPs</b>  <b>Reevaluation</b>  <b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other  <b>Transition</b>  <b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>  <b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements  See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements  <b>Corrective Actions re: San Diego City USD Self-Report Student Data</b> <b>Finding:</b> As self reported by the district, 20 students are not receiving related services: 14 physical therapy, 6 counseling, 1 transition services, 2 for supplementary aids and services. Student lists with parent names and telephone numbers were provided as required by CDE.  The district needs to provide CDE a current copy of the student's IEP portion describing the required service; billing records/time sheets of the contracted service provider implementing the student's IEP; a numerical calculation of the services <b>not</b> provided and plan for compensatory services for each of the students as determined by the IEP team; the IEP meeting notice: demonstrating student invited for the purpose of transition planning; and for compensatory services, an IEP notice that explicitly states the hours of compensatory services calculated for the student and the meeting purpose of determining compensatory services to meet the student's needs. 9/30/00  Transition noncompliance was also identified during the March 2000 Verification Review. See Corrective actions required.	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS          CDE will review all evidence required by 9/30/00.      CDE will conduct parent/student surveys re: related services provision, IEP development and participation; compensatory services provided by the district as agreed upon by the IEP team beginning 10/1/00   See CDE activities Verification review findings, March 2000	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99      Noncompliant 6/12/00      Noncompliant 3/20-21/2000

CDE Monitor: Fran Hill, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-3699, email: [fhill@cde.ca.gov](mailto:fhill@cde.ca.gov)  
 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>LYNWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>OAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None- 3 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Compliant	None- 9 NC Resolved	1996
<b>CCR</b>	1999	NA	None-did not submit	1999
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Compliant	4 Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	2 Decisions/orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on April 10-12, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school) **Note: Bolded items indicate OSEP identified areas of noncompliance in its California Monitoring Reports of 1996 and 1998)**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 4/10-12/00
5.0	In addition to item 4.0 above, the district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.	
9.0	A review a records reveals that signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
12.8	Evaluation reports do not include findings regarding determination of the environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.	
15.0	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).	
20.8	The IEP does not include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.	
24.0	The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP. (CASEMIS and LEA self-report)	
29.2	A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher, student, or other required participants at IEP meetings.	

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 4/10-12/00
-------------	-----------------	---------------------------

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are no reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. All compliance complaints are resolved as of this report.

The following areas are noncompliant:

- 15.0 LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial). CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)** 4/10-12/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Eight student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. Services of occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language services and counseling, often with multiple related services being provided to a student.

The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of school and district calendars
- Review of contractor billing records
- Review of service logs
- In person interviews with administrators including site principals, special education teachers and service providers including psychologists and counselors.
- Review of district policies and procedures regarding IEP implementation

### **FINDINGS**

1. Of the 8 students reviewed, three (3) students were not receiving occupational therapy and 2 students of these 3 students did not receive counseling services as well according to their IEPs.
2. Five (5) of the 8 students selected for this review were receiving services as stated on their IEPs.

### **CONCLUSION**

The district is found noncompliant regarding implementing the IEP for three students (occupation therapy and counseling services). Corrective actions are stated in the Corrective Action Plan for these individuals students.

**Lynwood Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)		Information currently being gathered by the district and sent to CDE. Not submitted as of this June 30, 2000 report.
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years		Same as above
Not receiving needed transition services		Same as above
Not receiving needed related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)		Same as above
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)		Same as above
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled		Same as above
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services		Same as above

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

<b>District</b>	<b>Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count</b>	<b># Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines</b>	<b># Students not receiving Reevaluation within</b>	<b>Percentage % Students not receiving timely</b>
-----------------	---------------------------------	---	---	---

		<b>COMPLIANT</b>	<b>timelines NONCOMPLIANT</b>	<b>reevaluations</b>
<b>Lynwood USD</b>	1, 360	1, 035	325	23.9%

### **Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs

Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)

December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

<b>District</b>	<b>Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count</b>	<b># Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT</b>	<b># Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT</b>	<b>Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews</b>
<b>Lynwood USD</b>	1, 360	845	515	37.9%



**Corrective Action Plan (CAP)**

**LYNWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1992, 1996 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1992, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 Not submitted to CDE		NA	NA
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 4 NC Resolved		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <b>Corrective Action Plan (DRAFT)</b> <i>CDE FMTA consultant met with Lynwood USD June 27-28, 2000 onsite to review all noncompliant findings including prior areas of noncompliance, if any, verification review findings for student records and IEP</i>		

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide evaluation plan to parents within 15 days of referral)	5.0	<p><i>implementation. Corrective actions are in discussion at the time of this June 30, 2000 report and may change to address each and every area of identified noncompliance.</i></p> <p><b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all required components.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct IEP within 50 days of written consent)	9.0	<p><b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation plan</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation.</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding timelines for completing IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage)	12.8	<p><b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to all required components for written evaluation reports</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Identification</b>	15.0	<b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has :</b>		Noncompliant

<b>&amp; Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation)		<p style="text-align: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;">11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	4/10-12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests)	20.8	<p><b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has :</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or district-wide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;">11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual review )	24.0	<p><b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has :</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;">11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher)	29.2	<p><b>Lynwood USD must provide evidence that it has :</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00

		<p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11/1/00</p>	including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	
<b>Verification Review-</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	
<b>Annual IEPs</b>		See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements		Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Reevaluation</b>		See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements		Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Related Services OT Counseling</b>		<p><b>Lynwood USD</b> will conduct IEP meetings for these students to discuss compensatory services for lack of occupational and counseling services not provided. Lynwood USD will provide CDE with a copy of the IEP meeting notice for these selected students and a copy of the IEP that states the compensatory services, if any, as determined by the IEP team, to be provided to these students.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Due to CDE 9/30/00</b></p> <p><b>Lynwood USD</b> will provide CDE documentation of service logs indicating IEPs are implemented as written for the selected students identified as not receiving counseling and occupational therapy as stated on their IEPs.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Due to CDE 9/30/00</b></p>	CDE review of written evidence and possible parent interview to determine that an IEP meeting was held and that services are provided as stated on the IEP.	Noncompliant 4/10-12/00
<b>PT</b>		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Compliant 4/10-12/00
<b>SLH</b>		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Compliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Other</b>		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Compliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Transition</b>		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Compliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Compliant 4/10-12/00
<b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Compliant 4/10-12/00

**CDE Monitor: Betty Carr, Consultant, Telephone: 916/322-9578 email: [bcarr@cde.ca.gov](mailto:bcarr@cde.ca.gov), FAX: 916/327-8878, Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
---

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>QAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/30/00	Compliant	None	6/30/00
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-4 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1995	Compliant	None-2 NC Resolved	1995
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Compliant	None-10 NC Resolved	3/3/00
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	6 NC Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	2 Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on June 5-6, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 6/5-6/00
3.0	Record review indicates that documenting classroom modifications conducted prior to special education referral.	
4.0	Review of records indicates that documenting assessment procedures such as: written notices to parents informing them that their child is being considered for special education; documenting that parents were provided with an assessment plan which includes the reason for assessment; type of assessment and person conducting the assessment and, documenting that assessments include consideration of parental information; IQ tests that are not in violation of state law and conducted within legal timelines.	
5.0	In addition to item 4.0 above, the district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.	
7.0	A review of records indicates the need to document vision and hearing screening as part of the initial and three-year evaluations.	
9.0	A review a records reveals that signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
10.0	A review of records indicates that the evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.	
12.0	There is evidence that evaluations do not result into written reports including all required information.	
12.2	The evaluation does not contain a statement regarding validity of the evaluation	
12.3	The evaluation does not include findings whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.	
12.4	A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.	

- 12.8 Evaluation reports do not include findings regarding determination of the environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 13.0 There is evidence that the district does not consistently provide parents with a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination.
- 15.0 LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).
- 20. 7 Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 20.8 Students IEPs do not include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.
- 20.12 Beginning at least one year before the student reaches the age of 18, the students IEPs do not state that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turning 18.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP. (CASEMIS and LEA self-report)
- 29.2 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher at IEP meetings.
- 34.0 For students beginning at age 14 and annually thereafter, the IEP does not contain goals and benchmarks that focus on the transition needs of the student in his/her course of study such as advanced placement courses or vocational education.
- 35.5 For students age 16 or younger, if appropriate, the IEP does not describe a coordinated set of transition activities.
- 35.6 For students age 16 or younger, if appropriate, the IEP does not state the interagency responsibilities or any needed linkages to implement transition activities.
- 36.0 The IEP team does not reconvene to identify alternative strategies to meet the transition objectives when a participating agency other than the district fails to provide transition services.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing the observations of relevant behavior of the student that have

been made by one team member other than the child's teacher (in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment).

- 78.1 The district notification does not contain a description of the action propose or refused.
- 78.2 The district's notification does not include an explanation of why the district proposes or refuses to take the action.
- 78.5 The district notification does not contain a description of any other factors that are relevant to the district's proposal or refusal.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)** 6/5-6/00

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. These include:

7.0 A review of records indicates the need to document vision and hearing screening as part of the initial and three-year evaluations. (Identified noncompliant in the 1999 CCR self-review and in the process of correction). This verification review demonstrated continued need for the district to correct this item previously identified. See Corrective Action Plan.

Timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99 and district self report. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

#### **Findings**

**Date(s)** 6/5-6/00

#### **METHOD OF REVIEW**



Eight (8) student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE.

The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of school and district calendars
- Review of contractor billing records
- Review of service logs
- In person interviews with administrators including site principals, special education teachers and service providers including psychologists and counselors.
- Review of district policies and procedures regarding IEP implementation
- In person interview with parent and student

## **FINDINGS**

1. Of the 8 students reviewed, one (1) student was not receiving counseling services according to the IEP. No records demonstrated that the student received counseling services for a sustained period of time. The student was receiving counseling services as stated on the IEP and was called in by the counselor to receive those services. However, once the counselor did not call for the student, the student did not avail himself of the services. Therefore, services were not implemented.

2. Seven (7) of the 8 students selected for this review were receiving services as stated on their IEPs.

## **CONCLUSION**

The district is found noncompliant regarding implementing the IEP for one student (counseling services). Corrective actions are stated in the Corrective Action Plan for this individual student.

### **Antelope Valley Union High School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	30	IEPs are in process of scheduling or are scheduled currently
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	40	Reevaluations are in process and/or IEPs are scheduled currently
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	39	IEPs are in process of scheduling or are scheduled currently
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b>	0	

Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)		
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Antelope Valley Union HSD	1, 623	1, 363	260	16.0%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Antelope Valley Union HSD	1, 623	1, 104	519	32.0%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1992, 1995 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1992, 1995
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –10 NC Resolved	6/30/00	None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 6 NC Resolved	6/30/00	Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp;</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <i>CDE FMTA consultant met with Antelope Valley HSD June 27-28, 2000 onsite to review all noncompliant</i>		



<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct hearing and vision screening)	7.0	<p>the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to vision and hearing screening.</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 6/5-6/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct IEP within 50 days of written consent)	9.0	<p>11/1/00</p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation plan</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation.</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding timelines for completing IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 6/5-6/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)	10.0	<p>11/1/00</p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 6/5-6/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b>	12.0	11/1/00		Noncompliant

<p>(Result in a written report or reports which include the findings of each evaluation and contain required information; Include statement of validity and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used &amp; Identification &amp; Evaluation (Include whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom) &amp; Identification &amp; Evaluation (Determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage)</p>	<p>12.2 12.3 12.4 12.6 12.8</p>	<p>This corrective action encompasses items 12.0, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.8 listed left. <b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to all required components for written evaluation reports 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide parents with a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination)</p>	<p>13.0</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of eligibility determination 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for providing parents with a copy of a evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation)</p>	<p>15.0</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>

<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress)</p>	<p>20.7</p>	<p>completing three year reevaluations and IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and ;how that information will be recorded in IEPs 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and ;how that information will be recorded in IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests)</p>	<p>20.8</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or district-wide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turn 18 at least one year prior to turning age 18)</p>	<p>20.12</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>

<p><b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual review )</p>	<p>24.0</p>	<p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have turned 17 years of age and who have had an IEP meeting since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 12/1/99, 6/12/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher)</p>	<p>29.2</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include all requirements for students age 14 and 16)</p>	<p>34.0 35.5 35.6</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to transition requirements for students age 14 and age 16.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to transition requirements for students age 14 and age 16.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students , ages 14-16 years of age, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, include</p>	<p>45.2</p>	<p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>



<p>observation of the student made by a team member other than the student's teacher)</p> <p><b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Provide prior written notice including description of action proposed or refused; an explanation of why the district proposes or refused to take the action); a description of any other options that they district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected;)</p>	<p>78.1 78.2 78.5</p>	<p>and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to transition requirements for students age 14 and age 16. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students , ages 14-16 years of age, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to provision of prior written notice to parents 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p> <p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p>
<p><b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs Reevaluation</b></p> <p><b>Related Services Counseling</b></p> <p><b>Transition</b></p> <p><b>OT PT SLH Other Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b></p>		<p><b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b> See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements <b>Antelope Valley Union HSD</b> will conduct an IEP meeting for the student to discuss compensatory services for lack of counseling services not provided. <b>Antelope Valley Union HSD</b> will provide CDE with a copy of the IEP meeting notice for the student and a copy of the IEP that states the compensatory services, if any, as determined by the IEP team, to be provided to the student. <b>Due to CDE 9/30/00</b></p> <p><b>Antelope Valley Union HSD</b> will provide CDE documentation of service logs indicating the IEP is implemented as written for the student identified as not receiving counseling as stated on their IEPs. <b>Due to CDE 9/30/00</b></p> <p><b>Noncompliant: See Corrective Actions for Items 34.0, 35.5, 35.6</b></p> <p>-0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified</p>	<p>See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS</p> <p>CDE review of written evidence and possible parent interview to determine that an IEP meeting was held and that services are provided as stated on the IEP.</p> <p>See CDE activities for Items 34.0, 35.5 &amp; 35.6 None required None required None required None required None required</p>	<p>Noncompliant 12/1/99 Noncompliant 12/1/99 Noncompliant 6/5-6/00</p> <p>Noncompliant 6/5-6/00 Compliant 6/5-6/00 Same as above Same as above Same as above Same as above</p>

Students-long term suspension expulsions		-0- Noncompliance identified	None required	Same as above
--	--	------------------------------	---------------	---------------

CDE  
916

**District Compliance Profile  
FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>OAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Compliant	None-12 NC Resolved	1996
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Compliant	10 NC Resolved	2/3/00
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	3NC Resolved, 1 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0- Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on April 17-18, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment

- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 4/17-18/00
4.0	The district does not consistently provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of referral	
5.5	The district does not consistently provide a statement that tests and other evaluation materials will be provided and administered in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication, and if not, the reasons why it is clearly not feasible, including any available independent evaluations.	
7.0	The district does not consistently provide a hearing and vision screening.	
12.2	The district does not consistently include a statement regarding the validity of the evaluation on the assessment/evaluation report and ....	
12.3	The district does not consistently include a statement in the evaluation report that the tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.	
12.4	The written report of the evaluation, which includes the findings of each evaluation, does not consistently include whether the student's needs can be met in the regular classroom.	
20.5	IEPs do not consistently provide descriptions of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to advance toward attaining annual goals, be involved and progress in the general education curriculum and participate in extracurricular activities and be educated and participate with non disabled children.	
20.9	There is no evidence that the district states the projected date for initiate services and modifications on IEPs.	
20.10	The district does not consistently provide the anticipated frequency, duration and location of the recommended services and modifications on IEPs.	

- 29.2 The district does not consistently include a general education teacher of the child as a member of the IEP team.
- 33.3 From a review of records, there is no evidence that Fremont USD provides a description of the activities provided to support the transition of pupils from the special education program into the regular education program.
- 77.0 From a review of records, there is evidence that Fremont USD does not consistently notify parents in writing a reasonable time before the district proposes to initiate or change the educational placement of a child (an IEP meeting). Nor does the notice include a statement about the purpose of the meeting.
- 78.1 Same as above
- 124.0 From a review of student records, there is no evidence that services are identified on the IFSP as required or nonrequired services.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)** 4/17-18/00

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are no reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified.

Timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)** 4/17-18/00

#### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Eight student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Telephone interviews with teachers and service providers (district personnel)
- Telephone interviews with teachers and service providers (Fremont School for the Deaf)
- In person interviews with administrators (district)
- In person interviews with administrators (Fremont School for the Deaf)

## **FINDINGS**

1. Through interviews and record analysis, there is a match of what is reported through interviews and what is required for implementation of the students IEPs.
2. A concern was raised through both interviews and student record reviews regarding the lack of Department of Mental Health and California Children's Service specificity of services in students IEPs. IEPs did not contain frequency, duration, and location regarding mental health or CCS provided services. CDE will follow up with district administration to ensure that the IEP teams, including CCS and MH service providers, provide the specifics of services required by Part B of IDEA.

## **CONCLUSION**

No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation. However, district self report provided to CDE on 6/12/00 identified noncompliance for 2 students not receiving transition services as required and 2 students not receiving supplementary aids and services. These are addressed in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Fremont Unified School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Local Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	438	<p>438 out of 3, 025 students files were out of compliance. 144 out of 3, 025 student files reviewed are less than 1 month out of compliance. Delivery of mail among the 42 schools to District Office, teachers waiting for end-of year-check out, unexpected illness or absence of IEP members, etc. should account for the reasonableness of "lateness" of MIS input with correct dates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ District has added a new program specialist position to monitor compliance issues as of 8/00.</li> <li>▪ All students out-of-compliance will have an annual review no later than September 15, 2000.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Specialists to monitor the out-of-compliance IEPs on a quarterly basis: August, 2000-November, 2000-January, 2001-April, 2001</li> <li>August/September 2000 inservices to staff and administrators will focus on annual completion of IEPs</li> <li>PL 107-15 and Ed Code sections will be provided at all Fall training sessions. Documentation of attendance, dates, handouts will be kept.</li> <li>Principals will receive monthly lists with IEP and 3 year-reevaluation dates as of August, 2000.</li> </ul> <p>Student names, parent names and phone numbers provided to CDE.</p>
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	108	<p>108 students out of 3, 025 students files reviewed were out of compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District has added 2 new psychologists as of 8/30/00</li> <li>Psychologists have been given a list of out-of-compliance reevaluations not later than 6/19/00 to bring all students into compliance by the end of September, 2000.</li> <li>Psychologists and principals to received quarterly triennial lists as of August, 2000-November, 2000-January, 2001-April, 2001</li> <li>Psychologists to update lists and issues on triennial review at monthly staff meetings as of August, 2000.</li> <li>Mission Valley SELPA and Directors to direct all staff to discontinue/destroy Form SE20 (dated 1/95) as of August 30, 2000.</li> </ul> <p>Student names, parent names and phone numbers provided to CDE</p>
Not receiving needed transition services	2	<p>2 out of 89 files reviewed had no evidence of transition.</p> <p>Fall Inservice Day (Sept. 2000) will address transition services as per Ed Code and Federal Register.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEP with transition component to be completed by end of September, 2000.</li> <li>IEP to be completed no later than 9/30/00 to complete transition services.</li> </ol>
Not receiving needed related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	None required
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	10 students had suspensions exceeding 10 days for 1999-2000 school year. Review of files demonstrated compliance.
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	10 students were part of expulsion proceedings for 1999-2000
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with	2	2 out of 93 files reviewed had not ;completed the supplemental aid/services sections of the IEP.

needed supplementary aids and services		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fall Staff Inservice will address need to check appropriate box and list needs on pages 2 and 3 of the IEP document.</li> <li>Program Specialists to meet with teacher of students to review this area and subsequent IEP meeting addendum's will be held by the end of September, 2000.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Fremont USD	3, 025	2, 808	217	7.2%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Fremont USD	3, 025	2, 627	398	13.2%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1992, 1996 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1992, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –10 NC Resolved 2/3/00		1999 10 NC CDE follow up Monitor	Compliant 2/3/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 3 NC Resolved, 1 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student</b>	<b>Item #</b> 5.0	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  Fremont USD must provide a list of students who have	CDE will select a	Noncompliant



<b>Records &amp; Topic</b>  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of referral)		<p>been evaluated since the beginning of the school year by 12/1/00</p> <p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures by 9/30/00</p>	<p>random sample (at least 10 referrals) to review documentation as evidence that evaluation plans are provided within 15 days of the referral.</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required</p>	<p>4/17-18/00</p>
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation plan provides a statement that tests and evaluation materials will be provided and administered in pupil's primary language or mode of communication and if not reasons why not feasible including independent evaluations)	<p>5.5</p>	<p>Fremont USD must provide evidence that the district revised evaluation plan/assessment plan form contains all of the required components. In addition, the district is provide CDE a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements: notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all multidisciplinary assessment team and special education staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/01</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p> <p>CDE will select a random sample (at least 10 referrals) to review documentation as evidence that the tests were administered in the pupils primary language.</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct vision and hearing screening)	<p>7.0</p>	<p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all multidisciplinary assessment staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/01</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p> <p>CDE will randomly select at least 10 student records for review to seek evidence that students received hearing and vision screening, unless parent permission was denied.</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<b>Evaluation</b> (statement of validity and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used)	<p>12.2 12.3</p>	<p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all multidisciplinary assessment staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of psychological and other assessment reports done between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p> <p>CDE will randomly select 10 of these assessment reports to see if they contain information about validity of assessment.</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>

<b>Evaluation</b> (Include whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom)	12.4	<p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all multidisciplinary assessment staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of psychological and other assessment reports done between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p> <p>CDE will randomly select 10 of these assessment reports to see if they contain information about how the student's needs can be met in the regular classroom.</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
	20.5	<p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all special education staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of the IEPs between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p> <p>CDE will randomly select 10 of these IEPs to determine if the records contain statements of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to participate in the general education program.</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
	20.9 20.10	<p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all special education staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of the IEPs between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p> <p>CDE will randomly select 10 of the records to determine compliance by checking the IEPs for projected date for initiated services and modifications; the anticipated frequency, duration and location of the recommended services and modifications.</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
	29.2	<p>Fremont USD is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00

<p>education teacher in the IEP)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Provide a description of activities provided to support the transition of the student from special education to regular education)</p> <p><b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written Notice Requirements)</p> <p><b>IFSP</b> (Identify services as required or</p>		<p>the requirements, policies and procedures; and that an inservice has been provided to all special education staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00</p> <p>Fremont USD must provide CDE with a list of the IEPs between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE will randomly select 10 of the records to determine compliance; the IEPs contain evidence that the general education teacher of the child participated in the IEP If the child is in or may be participating in general education.</p>	
	33.2	<p><b>Fremont USD</b> must provide a list of IEPs done between 6/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p> <p>The district is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that inservice has been provided regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE will randomly select 10 IEP records to determine compliance: the IEP records contain evidence that the district provided support to transition the pupil from the special education program into any aspect of the regular education program, part of full day.</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
	77.0 78.1	<p><b>Fremont USD</b> must provide a list of IEPs done between 6/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p> <p>The district is to provide a copy of the policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that inservice has been provided regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 12/1/00</p>	<p>CDE will randomly select 10 IEP records to determine compliance: the student's record contains evidence that the district provided written notice a reasonable time before the scheduled IEP meeting to discuss the initiation or change to the child's educational placement or provision of FAPE. The written notice must include a description of the action proposed.</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
	124	<p><b>Fremont USD</b> must provide a list of IFSPs done between 6/1/00 and 11/30/00. 12/1/00</p> <p>The district is to provide a copy of the policies and</p>	<p>CDE will randomly select IFSPs to determine compliance: the</p>	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00

<b>nonrequired</b>		procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements; notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; and that inservice has been provided regarding the requirements, policies and procedures. 12/1/00	student's record contains evidence that services are identified as required or nonrequired.	
<b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs Reevaluation Related Services OT PT SLH Counseling Other Transition  Supplementary Aids &amp; Services  Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements  -0- noncompliance identified  The district will provide CDE with a revised copy of the IEPs for the two identified students not receiving transition services demonstrating compliance. 10/1/00  The district will provide CDE with a revised copy of the IEPs for the two identified students not receiving supplementary aids and services demonstrating compliance. 10/1/00  -0- noncompliance identified	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS   None required  CDE review of required evidence and possible telephone survey with parents  CDE review of required evidence and possible telephone survey with parents None required	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00  Compliant 4/17-18/00 Noncompliant 6/12/00  Noncompliant 6/12/00  Compliant 4/17-18/00

**CDE Monitor: Ellen Broms, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-3654, email: [ebroms@cde.ca.gov](mailto:ebroms@cde.ca.gov)  
916/327-3534 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>W.CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
---

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><u>QAP Findings</u></i>	<i><u>Date(s)</u></i>	<i><u>Current Status</u></i>	<i><u>Required Corrective Actions</u></i>	<i><u>Date(s)</u></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	1998	Compliant	None	1998
<b>CCR:</b>	1991	Compliant	None- 9 NC Resolved	1991
<b>CCR:</b>	1994	Compliant	None-13 NC Resolved	1994
<b>CCR</b>	1998	Compliant	None-12 NC Resolved	1998
<b>CCR (Self Review)</b>	Not due			
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	10 NC Resolved, 1 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-	Decisions/Orders	1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**  
**Conducted by CDE on March 8,13, 23, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 3/8,13,23/00
4.0	LEA does not provide parents with a written notice that their child is being considered for special education referral.	
7.0	All students who are evaluated for an initial or three year reevaluation do not receive a hearing and vision screening unless parental permission is denied.	
8. 1	Assessments are not administered in the child's native language or mode of communication.	
9.0	Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
10.0	Evaluations do not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general education curriculum.	
20.5	Results of tests are not administered in the primary language by qualified personnel.	
12.2	Evaluations do not contain a statement of the validity of the evaluation.	
12.3	Evaluations do not state whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.	
12.4	Evaluations do no state whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom.	
12.8	The evaluation does not contain include findings of the determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.	
15.0	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).	
20.1	Students IEPs do not include a statement of the child's present levels of performance including how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum.	

- 20.5 Students IEPs do not include a description of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.6 Students IEPs do not include a description of including an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not with nondisabled children in the regular class and extracurricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.7 Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 20.12 Students IEPs do not include the projected date for initiate of services.
- 24 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP.
- 24.1 The IEP team does not review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (short term objectives).
- 29.2 The IEP team does not include at least one general education teacher of the child (if the child is in or may be participating in general education).
- 33.1 The IEP team does not include a description of activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education program indicating the nature of each activity, and the time spent on the activity each day or week.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP does not include information regarding observation of any relevant behavior of the student in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment made by one team member other than the child's teacher.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Item Findings**

**Date(s) 3/8, 13, 23,/00**

In addition to a review of approximately 75 student records, a review of the district's compliance history, prior Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) findings of noncompliance, complaint noncompliance or due process findings from the previous four years was conducted to determine if the problems continue to be resolved.

The reoccurring noncompliances noted in this review are:

- 15.0 The district does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial). This noncompliance was also noted in CASEMIS data, 12/1/99.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review, but not less than annually, the student's IEP. This noncompliance was also noted in CASEMIS data, 12/1/99.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

#### **Findings**

**Date(s)** 3/8, 15/00

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of service logs
- Review of staff time sheets
- Student/staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents, teachers and service providers
- Telephone interviews with one student
- In person interview with administrators

No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation.

### **W. Contra Costa Unified School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Local Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	364	See narrative following



Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	862	See narrative following
Not receiving needed transition services	0	
Not receiving needed related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

### **1. OVERDUE IEPs**

ISSUES: Special Education Administrators/Program Specialists have been trying to monitor overdue IEPs. The major problem is the lack of experienced and credentialed special education teachers. Due to our low salary scale, it is very hard to attract teachers to our district. The majority of our new hires are first year teachers working on an emergency credential. The district recruited 6 teachers from the Philippines who had never written an IEP. Three teachers were resigned mid-year and five teachers went out during the year on medical leave. Also, disciplinary action has been taken against four teachers. In the past week (prior to June 12, 2000) one teacher committed suicide and one teacher was hospitalized before completing their IEPs. Two mentor teachers have been used to help the inexperienced teachers and credentialed teachers have been paid stipend to help new teachers write IEPs. Moreover, two of our four Special Education Administrative positions are open. One resigned and the other died unexpectedly. In addition, we have a 35%-45% turnover rate in special education teachers annually. We train them, then they leave to other districts that have better salary scales and better working conditions.

Based upon the Quality Assurance Program Verification Review, the following process will be implemented beginning June 2000:

- Program Specialists/Special Education Administrators will be given updated MIS overdue lists monthly.
- Program specialists/Special Education Administrators will monitor their sites for overdue IEPs and report any problems to the SELPA Director.
- SELPA Director will inform site Principals of Special Education teachers who are not meeting IEP timelines. Principals will follow district disciplinary procedures.
- Regional Superintendents will be emailed monthly lists of overdue IEPs within their Regions.
- Monthly IEP writing workshops will be offered to newly hired teachers.
- SELPA Director will monitor over IEP lists on a bi-weekly basis and discuss issues with Special Education Administrators/Program Specialists at their weekly meetings.

- Through the implementation of the Peer Assistance Review (PAR), inexperienced and teachers given unsatisfactory reviews will be assisted by a peer with a background in special education.
- MIS reporting data will be correct/up to date.

### **3. OVERDUE 3 YEAR REEVALUATION**

1990-1997-When the district went into bankruptcy in 1990-91-11 psychologist positions were cut-from 17.4 to 6.4. These 6.4 FTE psychologists attempted to do all the District's testing for a period of two years. In 1993-94, the psychology department was increased to 8.4 FTE. Each subsequent year, as money became available, psychologist FTEs were increased. By the Fall of 1997, the number of psychologists was increased to 17.2 as money became available from one-time funds from the Governor.

In April 1998, there was a compliance investigation concerning psychological services. The district agreed to hire 4 additional psychologists and expand the psychology Internship program that was started in the 1997-98 school year.

In 1998-99-The Psychology Department grew to 21.2 positions and was fully staffed. The staff was making headway towards compliance with 3 year reevaluations. Also, five interns were on staff.

1999-2000-The district currently has 6 open psychology positions and two psychologists on medical leave. Also, we had five interns, but one quit in January 2000.

During the 1999-2000 school year, the district was unable to fill all their psychology positions due to a noncompetitive salary scale. At the end of the 1998-99 school year, 4 psychologists resigned, one was released and three psychologists reduced their time. Due to our low salaries, we were not able to attract any new psychologists. During the 1999-00 school year, one psychologist died; one resigned and two went out on medical leave. We were in the process of working towards compliance, but this year personnel issues have set us back. Psychologists were offered per diem pay to work Saturdays.

Based on the Quality Assurance Program Verification Review, the following process will be implemented June 2000 to work toward compliance by July 2001:

- \$110, 000 has been approved for psychologists to work this summer on three year reevaluations.
- Psychologists have the option of working Saturdays at per diem pay during the school year.
- The district is negotiating with the United Teachers of Richmond (UTR) to approve a new salary scale which will increase the starting salary of first year psychologist by \$11,000 to attract new psychologists and fill all the vacancies for the 2000-2001 school year.
- The Quality Assurance Program consultant hired by the district is developing updated policies and guidelines for completing 3 year reevaluations.
- All psychologists who are working during the summer of 2000, will be inserviced on the updated 3 year reevaluations policies the week of June 19, 2000.
- One additional FTE for a full time behaviorist has been approved by the School Board for 2000-2001.
- Psychology Department will implement a "RAMBO TEAM". This team of psychologists will spend two-three weeks at one site to update 3 year reevaluations, then move on to the next school, etc.
- Goal is to have all 3 year reevaluations current by July 2001.
- Monthly monitoring of caseload, quality and quantity of completed evaluations by SELPA Director.

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
W. Contra Costa USD	4, 755	3,850	905	19.0%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
W. Contra Costa USD	4, 755	3, 686	1, 069	22.5%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### W.CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>	<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required 1998	None required	Compliant to 6/30/02
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required 1991, 1994, 1998 NC Resolved	None required	Compliant
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	Not due	NA	NA
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 10 NC Resolved, 1 Open	Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data Conduct reevaluations for identified students	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> 6/15/00 1. Review and correct data for identified students 2. Conduct annual reviews for identified students	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99

Verification Review-Student Records	Item #	Verification Review –Student Records :		
<b>Referral &amp; Identification</b> (Provide written notice to parents that child is being considered for special education)	4.0	<p><b>For all Corrective Actions, the W. Contra Costa USD must provide evidence to CDE by January 1, 2001 that it has:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal requirements related to provision of a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the provision of a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral.</li> </ol> <p>W. Contra Costa USD will provide CDE with a list of students who have been considered for special education referral, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number</p> <p>W. Contra Costa USD will provide a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral</p>	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	<p>Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00</p> <p>Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00</p>
<b>Referral &amp; Identification</b> (Vision and hearing screening)	7.0	W. Contra Costa USD will provide ten (10) evaluation reports that reflect hearing and vision screenings	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Referral &amp; Identification</b> (Administer evaluations in the child's native language or mode of communication)	8.1	W. Contra Costa USD will provide ten (10) evaluation reports that reflect assessments for students in the child's native language or mode of communication	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 & possible survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Referral &amp; Identification</b> (Conduct IEP within 50 days of written consent)	9.0	W. Contra Costa USD will provide a log that demonstrates timelines from written consent to IEP development	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and possible survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (Evaluation to include information related to enabling child to	10.0	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports to demonstrate that information related to submit ten (10) evaluation reports to demonstrate that information related to enabling the child to be involved in the general education program is consistently	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and possible survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00

be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)		addressed		
<b>Evaluation</b> (Results of tests administered in primary language by qualified personnel)	12.1	M W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports to demonstrate that information related to providing qualified personnel to administer tests in the child's primary language is consistently addressed	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and possible survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (validity statement)	12.2	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports as of June 1, 2000 that reflect a statement of validity of the evaluation for any population for which validity may be a factor	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and possible survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Statement whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used)	12.3	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports that have been developed after June 1, 2000 that statements that the tests used are valid for the intended purposes	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Statement whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom)	12.4	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports as of June 1, 2000 that demonstrate information about whether the student's needs can be met in the regular classroom	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting)	12.6	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports as of 11/1/00 that demonstrate information about relevant behavior is noted during observation of the child in an appropriate setting	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Determination of effects of environment, cultural, or economic disadvantage )	12.8	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) evaluation reports as of 11/1/00 that demonstrate information about determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation)	15.0	W. Contra Costa USD will submit a log that demonstrates timelines and completion dates of three-year reevaluations	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00

<b>IEP</b> (Present levels of performance including description of how the disability affects the child's involvement in the general curriculum)	20.1	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs as of June 1, 2000 which include statements and description of how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum and is included in the IEPs	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP</b> (Program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable students to succeed in the general education classroom)	20.5	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs as of June 1, 2000 which include statements that program modifications and supports for school personnel that will enable students to succeed in the general education classroom are included in IEPs	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP-LRE</b> (Explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extracurricular and nonacademic activities)	20.6	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which include an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate in the regular class and extracurricular and nonacademic activities by	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP</b> (Statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress)	20.7	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPS that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which include a statement of how parents will be informed of their child's progress	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP-LRE</b> (Include anticipated frequency, duration and location of recommended services and modifications)	20.10	W. Contra Costa USD will provide a log that demonstrates timelines from written consent to IEP development	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP-Annual Review</b> (Include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals,	24.1	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPS that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which demonstrate that student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00

benchmarks, and in the general curriculum)				
<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher in the IEP)	29.2	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which include a statement that the general education teacher is included in the IEP meeting	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP</b> (Transition from special classes-centers or NPS to general education)	33.1	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which include a statements of related to supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic nonsectarian school to the general education classroom in the public school	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP</b> (Description of activities to integrate the special education student into the regular education program)	33.2	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which include statements related to providing a description of activities provided to support the transition of children from the special education program into the regular education program	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, IEPs certify that observations of the student's behavior have been made by a team member of than the child's teacher)	45.2	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IEPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 that observations of behavior of a student with a learning disability have been made by a team member other than the child's teacher	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IFSP Part C</b> (Include a statement of the specific early intervention services necessary to meet the unique needs of the infant or toddler and the family to achieve the outcomes)	123.5	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IFSPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which demonstrate compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>IFSP Part C</b> (Appropriate justification for service not being provided in the natural environment)	123.5.4	W. Contra Costa USD will submit ten (10) IFSPs that have been developed after June 1, 2000 which demonstrate compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews ( <b>natural environments</b> )	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/8,13,23/00



<b>Verification Review-</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>	<b>See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS</b>	
<b>Annual IEPs</b>		See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements		Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Reevaluation</b>		See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements		Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Related Services OT PT SLH Counseling Other</b>		-0- Systemic Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Transition</b>		-0- Systemic Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>		-0- Systemic Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 3/8,13,23/00
<b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		-0- Systemic Noncompliance Identified	Non required	Compliant 3/8,13,23/00

*CDE Monitor: Mike Hancock, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-3637 email:*

*[mhancock@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mhancock@cde.ca.gov) FAX: 916/327-3534 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814*

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
---

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><u>QAP Findings</u></i>	<i><u>Date(s)</u></i>	<i><u>Current Status</u></i>	<i><u>Required Corrective Actions</u></i>	<i><u>Date(s)</u></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	7/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-1 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR</b>	1996	Compliant	None-1 NC Resolved	1996
<b>(Self Review)</b>	1999	Compliant	None-11 NC Resolved	10/18/99
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	3 NC Resolved, 3 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0- Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on March 29-30, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment

- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>
		3/29-30/00
3.0	The district does not demonstrate that school site staff document attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral for special education services.	
4.0	LEA does not provide parents with a written notice that their child is being considered for special education referral.	
5.0	LEA does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.	
9.0	Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
12.2	LEA is not providing qualified personnel to administer tests in the child's primary language.	
12.2	There is no statement of validity of the evaluation reported.	
12.3	Evaluation reports do not include a statement that the tests used for each child's evaluation are valid for the intended purpose.	
12.4	Evaluation reports do not include whether the students needs can be met in the general classroom.	
12.5	Evaluation reports do not include whether the student needs special education or related services.	

- 12.6 Evaluation reports do not include relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting.
- 12.7 Evaluation reports do not include any educationally relevant health, developmental and medical findings, if any.
- 12.8 Evaluation reports do not include a determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 15.0 Three year reevaluations are not completed on time.
- 15.2 Evaluation reports do not include additions or modifications to special education and related services that are needed to enable the child to meet measurable goals annual goals.
- 16.0 Under new IDEA requirements, 3 year reevaluations do not consider the following in determining the need for additional information.
- 16.2 Under new IDEA requirements, 3 year reevaluations do not consider the following in determining the need for additional information including review of information provided by the parent.
- 16.3 Under new IDEA requirements, 3 year reevaluations do not consider the following in determining the need for additional information including review of teacher and related service provider information.
- 17.0 The district does not conduct an appropriate reevaluation of the child prior to transitioning from kindergarten to first grade.
- 20.1 IEPs do not consistently include a statement of the child's present levels of performance including how the disability affects the child's involvement in the general curriculum.
- 20.3 IEPs do not consistently demonstrate a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the educational services to be provided and the student's goals and benchmarks.
- 20.4 IEPs do not consistently include a statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services to be provided to the child or on behalf of the child.
- 20.5 IEPs do not consistently include descriptions of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to the child.
- 20.7 IEPs do not include a statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress

- 20.8 IEPs do not include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.
- 20.10 IEPs do not consistently include the anticipated frequency, duration and location of the recommended services and modifications.
- 24.0 The district does not always complete the annual review IEPs on time.
- 24.1 The annual IEP review did not include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum.
- 29.2 Record reviews shows that the general education teacher is not included in the IEP meeting.
- 29.2.1 Record reviews show that the general education teacher does not participate in IEPs.
- 77.0 Parents do not receive written notice from the district in a reasonable time.
- 78.1 Written notices do not include a description of the action proposed or refused.
- 78.4 Written notices do not include a description of each evaluation procedure, test, record or report the district used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.
- 78.7 Written notices do not include sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of the procedural safeguards.
- 89.0 A regular education teacher is not included on the preschool age child's IEP team if the child is or may be participating in a regular education environment.
- 91.0 There is no evidence that, to the maximum extent appropriate, preschool age children are education with children who are not disabled and special classes, separate school and other removal from the regular education environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of the child is such that education in regular preschool classes (with the use of supplementary aids and services) cannot be achieved satisfactorily.
- 94.0 There is no evidence that the duration of group services for preschool age children does not exceed four hours unless determined otherwise in the child's IEP.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Item Findings****Date(s)** 3/29-30/00

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there two reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. CCR self review findings were compliant as of 10/18/00. However, Items 3.0 and 20.3 were identified as noncompliant during the recent CDE verification review process and a addressed in the Corrective Action Plan.

- 3.0 LEA does not have documentation (written policies and procedures) available to parents and school site staff describing the relationship among identification, screening, referral.
- 20.3 The IEP team does not review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives)

In addition, timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99 and district self report of 6/12/00 and verification review findings. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

<b>CCR District Self Review Findings Submitted to CDE July 1, 1999</b>
--

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Status:</b> Compliant	<b>Date(s)</b> CDE closed 10/18/00
3.0	LEA does not have documentation (written policies and procedures) available to parents and school site staff describing the relationship among identification, screening, referral.		
15	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).		
20.3	The IEP team does not review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives)		
26	The LEA does not conduct an IEP team meeting and review information, records, reports and evaluations from previous records and make final recommendations for placement before the expiration of a 30 day interim placement.		
58.1	Resource Specialists caseloads exceed 28 pupils.		

- Language, speech and hearing specialists caseloads exceed an average of 55 in districts, county offices or SELPAs
- The LEA does not hold IEP meetings even if the parent has received proper notice of the meeting, chooses not to participate in the IEP meeting or to consent to an extension beyond 20 consecutive school days.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)** 3/29-30/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student files were randomly pulled from the file review in the student record reviews. Of the ten (10) students, two (2) had moved out of the district and two (2) have been transferred to the Orange County Office of Education special education program for special education services. Six (6) of the students are currently receiving special education programs and services from Garden Grove USD. Student services reviewed included speech, language, adaptive P.E., counseling and the Resource Specialist Program. The following activities were conducted:

- Review of students IEPs
- Review of service provider logs
- Interviews with teachers, parents and students

### **FINDINGS**

1. IEPs are current and implemented as written.
2. Copies of IEPs have been provided to parents.
3. Parents have indicated that they are satisfied with the services their children are receiving.
4. Students were interested in attending school and felt support by their teachers

### **CONCLUSIONS**

For students the IEPs reviewed in which Garden Grove USD provides special education programs and services, no noncompliances were found. Students were receiving services as written on their IEP. Pending information from the county office, including interviews, it appears that all students are receiving services as stated on their IEPs.

### **Garden Grove Unified School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

Compliance Area	Number of	District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance
-----------------	-----------	--

<b>for Students:</b>	<b>Students</b>	
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	726	<p>Because this request came at the end of the school year, a great many conflicts existed for us in providing complete and up-to-date information. Our secretaries are working extremely hard to input information regarding close of year, summer school and two other requests from the state. As a result, the attached information will be more accurately reflected by June 30<sup>th</sup>. At that time, CDE will be provided with a new list of students that will certainly bring down the numbers listed on the attached pages.</p> <p>All of our principals, special education teachers and DIS personnel were provided a list of their students and current IEP/Reevaluation status. School sites were encouraged to input all of their outstanding current data. In addition, all principals were asked to review the data with their teachers/psychologists and complete overdue IEPs and reevaluations. In addition, a secretary was designed at the district level to input all data as it was submitted to my office. Data is being inputted daily. The Superintendent has granted approval for the addition of five (5) new speech pathologists and three (3) psychologists. The new personnel will support our efforts in bringing all IEPs and reevaluations up to date. Also, two (2) psychologists have been hired to assist with overdue reevaluations during the summer.</p> <p>District provided CDE with list of student names, parent names, phone numbers and addresses.</p>
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	411	Same as above
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b>  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services</b>	0	

### **CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

#### **Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)



December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Minimal Noncompliance**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

<b>District</b>	<b>Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count</b>	<b># Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT</b>	<b># Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines NONCOMPLIANT</b>	<b>Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations</b>
<b>Garden Grove USD</b>	4, 928	4, 888	40	.08%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs

Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)

December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

<b>District</b>	<b>Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count</b>	<b># Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT</b>	<b># Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT</b>	<b>Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews</b>
<b>Garden Grove USD</b>	4, 928	4, 124	804	16.3%

<p align="center"><b>Corrective Action Plan (CAP)</b></p> <p align="center"><b>GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
---

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1992, 1996 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1992, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 – all NC resolved	6/30/00	None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 3 NC Resolved, 3 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic Identification</b>	<b>Item #</b>  3.0	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to documenting attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral to 9/30/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00	Noncompliant 3/29-30/00

<b>&amp; Evaluation</b> (School site staff document attempts to modify the general curriculum prior to referral for special education)		special education. 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures. 4. Provided CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have been considered for special education referral, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (written notice of referral to parents)	4.0	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports included all required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures. 3. Provided CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	Review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 3/29-30/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation plan within 15 days)	5.0	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation than contains all of the required contents. 4. Provided CDE with a list of students who have been referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 3/29-30/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Signed evaluation plan resulting in an IEP within 50 days)	9.0	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within fifty days of obtaining written parental consent to an evaluation; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00	Noncompliant 3/29-30/00

		<p>administrators regarding the timelines for completing IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Qualified staff to administer tests in child's primary language; statement of validity; and that tests are (valid for intended purposes; include whether student needs special education or related services; include relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting; include any educationally relevant health, developmental and medical findings, if any; and include a determination of effects of environment, cultural, or economic disadvantage )</p>	<p>12.1</p> <p>12.2</p> <p>12.3</p> <p>12.4</p> <p>12.5</p> <p>12.6</p> <p>12.7</p> <p>12.8</p>	<p><b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/29-30/00</p>
			<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	
				<p>Noncompliant 3/29-30/00</p>
<p><b>Evaluation</b> (3 year to review information provided by the parent, review of teacher and related service provider information)</p>	<p>15.0</p> <p>15.2</p> <p>16.0</p> <p>16.2</p> <p>16.3</p>	<p><b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations including all required information needed and subsequent IEP meetings;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/29-30/00</p>
			<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	



<p>enable students to succeed in the general education classroom.)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether their child will take district or statewide achievement tests.)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Include anticipated frequency, duration and location of services and modifications)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Annual Reviews conducted on time)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher in the IEP)</p>	<p>20.7 20.8 20.10</p> <p>24.0 24.1</p> <p>29.2 29.2.1</p>	<p><b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol> <p><b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol> <p><b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the participation of general education teachers in the IEP;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/29-30/00</p> <p>Noncompliant 3/29-30/00</p> <p>Noncompliant 3/29-30/00</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written Notice Requirements)	77.0 78.1 78.7	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to provision of prior written notice to parents; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of required evidence due 9/30/00	Noncompliant 3/29-30/00
	89.0	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students, age three to five years, who have had an IEP since May 2000, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
	91.0	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of preschool children with nondisabled preschool children in regular preschool classes and removal only occurs when severity of the child's disability is such (even with the use of supplementary aids and services) that the education with preschool children in a regular education environment cannot be achieved satisfactorily; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of preschool children with nondisabled preschool children in regular preschool classes 4. Provide CDE with a list of students, age three to five years, who have had an IEP since May 2000, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>IEP- Preschool</b> (Including a regular education teacher in the IEP if the child is or may be participating in a regular education environment )				
<b>IEP- Preschool</b> (To the maximum extent appropriate, preschool children are education with children who are not disabled; students removed from the regular education environment only when the nature or severity of the disability (with the use of supplementary aids and services) cannot be satisfactorily achieved.				
<b>IEP- Preschool</b>	94.0	<b>Garden Grove USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state	CDE review of	Noncompliant 3/29-30/00

(Duration of group services not to exceed 4 hrs. unless IEP determined)		and federal laws and regulations related to duration of group services for preschool children with disabilities; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures to duration of group services for preschool children with disabilities 4. Provided CDE with a list of students, age three to five years, who have had an IEP since May 2000, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs</b>  <b>Reevaluation</b>  <b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other  <b>Transition</b>  <b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>  <b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements  -0- Noncompliance Identified   -0- Noncompliance Identified  -0- Noncompliance Identified  -0- Noncompliance Identified	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS   None required   None required  None required  None required	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99& 6/12/00 Compliant 3/29-6/26/00  Compliant 3/29-6/26/00 Compliant 3/29-6/26/00 Compliant 3/29-6/26/00

**CDE Monitor: Shelley Harris, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-4221, email: [sharris@cde.ca.gov](mailto:sharris@cde.ca.gov)  
FAX: 916/327-5233 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**



<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>MODESTO CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>OAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	10/99	Compliant	None-0- NC Identified	10/99
<b>CCR:</b>	1993	Compliant	None-0- NC Identified	1993
<b>CCR:</b>	1997	Compliant	None-0- NC Identified	
<b>CCR</b>	1999	TBD-To be submitted to CDE		7/1/00
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Compliant	7 NC Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on May 23-24, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment

- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/23-24/00
12.2	There is evidence that Modesto Elementary School District does not consistently include a statement regarding the validity of the evaluation.	
12.3	There is evidence that Modesto Elementary School District does not consistently state whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.	

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/23-24/00
	Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there or no reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified.	
	Timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99 and district self report of 6/12/00. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.	

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

<b>METHOD OF REVIEW</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/23-24/00
-------------------------	---------------------------

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. In particular, 4 of the 10 student records selected were students suspended/expelled with varying areas of related services stated on the IEP. All of the selected students had 1 ore more related services such as speech, language and hearing, behavior intervention plans, transition, adaptive physical education, occupation therapy. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student's IEP
- Review of service logs
- Review of student attendance sheets
- Student/staff observations (varied: on the playground, library, general education classroom – core curriculum, Special Day Classes, Resource Specialists Programs)
- Telephone interviews with parents
- In person interviews with teachers (general and special education)
- In person interviews with service providers
- In person interviews with site principals
- In person interview with district administrators

## **FINDINGS**

1. Principals knowledge and involvement of student's needs and IEPs requirements were evident.
2. Students receiving special education that are under disciplinary measure receive FAPE as IEPs are implemented as written.
3. Students with multiple services receive all services stated on their IEPs.
4. Staff observed implemented required services as stated on the IEP.
5. Parents reported that their children received services stated on the IEP and a high level of satisfaction with the special education program and services provided.

## **CONCLUSION**

No noncompliances were noted as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation. Through interviews, observation and record review, all selected students receive their services as stated on their IEPs.

### **Modesto City Elementary School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	52	Beginning July 1, 2000, the Special Education Local Plan Area office will notice year round and traditional school sites on a

		<p>monthly basis as to Individual Education Plans and Triennial Evaluations due. In turn, completed IEPs and evaluations will be submitted to the SELPA office monthly for input into CASEMIS.</p> <p>A monthly report will be generated from the SELPA office for principals and special education staff to insure that no students are missed in the fulfillment of this requirement.</p> <p>Student Names, Parent names and telephone numbers provided to CDE 6/12/00</p>
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	64	Same as above
Not receiving needed transition services	0	
Not receiving needed related services Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines  NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Modesto City USD	2, 869	2,580	289	10.1%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews

Modesto City USD				9.8%
---------------------	--	--	--	------

**Corrective Action Plan (CAP)**  
**MODESTO CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>	<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required	None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1993, 1997 –0- Noncompliance	None required	Compliant 1993, 1997
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	Due to CDE 7/1/00	TBD	TBD
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 7 NC Resolved	Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00 1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00 Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00

<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (statement of validity and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used)	<b>Item #</b>  12.2 12.3	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <b>Modesto Elementary School District must provide evidence that it has :</b>  1. Provided a copy of the policies and procedures to CDE to ensure compliance with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports included all required contents; 2. Notified staff and administrators regarding the requirements, policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice has been provided to all staff and administrators regarding these evaluation requirements, policies and procedures. 9/30/00 4. Provided CDE with 10 initial or triennial evaluation reports done between 10/1/00 and 11/30/00 that include statements regarding the validity of the evaluation and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used. 12/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00   CDE review of evidence required.	Noncompliant 5/23-24/00
<b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs</b>  <b>Reevaluation</b>   <b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other  <b>Transition</b>  <b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>  <b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements  -0-Noncompliant findings  -0-Noncompliant findings  -0-Noncompliant findings  -0-Noncompliant findings	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS   None required   None required None required None required	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00  Compliant 5/23-24/00  Compliant 5/23-24/00 Compliant 5/23-24/00 Compliant 5/23-24/00

CDE Monitor: Beth Rice, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-0843 email: [brice@cde.ca.gov](mailto:brice@cde.ca.gov)  
 FAX: 917/327-8878 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>NORWALK – LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>QAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	7/97	Compliant	None	7/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1991	Compliant	None-6 NC Resolved	1991
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Compliant	None-11 NC Resolved	1996
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Noncompliant	3 NC Resolved	6/30/00
	1999			
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	8 NC Resolved , 3 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on May 9-11, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment

- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>
		5/9-11/00
3.0	Record review indicates that documenting classroom modifications conducted prior to special education referral.	
4.0	Review of records indicates that documenting assessment procedures such as: written notices to parents informing them that their child is being considered for special education; documenting that parents were provided with an assessment plan which includes the reason for assessment; type of assessment and person conducting the assessment and, documenting that assessments include consideration of parental information; IQ tests that are not in violation of state law and conducted within legal timelines.	
5.8	The evaluation plan does not indicate alternative means, as appropriate.	
7.0	A review of records indicates the need to document vision and hearing screening as part of the initial and three-year evaluations.	
10.0	A review of records indicates that the evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.	
12.2	The evaluation does not contain a statement regarding validity of the evaluation	
12.3	The evaluation does not include findings whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.	
12.6	A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information regarding relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting.	
12.8	Evaluation reports do not include findings regarding determination of the environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.	
15.0	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).	



- 15.2 Evaluation reports do not include information if additions or modifications to special education and related services are needed to enable the child to meet measurable annual goals.
- 16.2 Three year evaluations do not include a review of information provided by the parent.
- 20.5 Student's IEPs do not include a description of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.7 Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 20.8 Students IEPs do not contain a statement whether the child will participate in district or statewide achievement tests.
- 20.12 Beginning at least one year before the student reaches the age of 18, the students IEPs do not state that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turning 18.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP. (CASEMIS and LEA self-report)
- 24.1 The IEP team does not review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (short term objectives).
- 29.2 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher at IEP meetings.
- 29.8 A review of records indicates an absence of the child, when appropriate, or when the IEP meetings will be considering postsecondary transition.
- 34.0 For students beginning at age 14 and annually thereafter, the IEP does not contain goals and benchmarks that focus on the transition needs of the student in his/her course of study such as advanced placement courses or vocational education.
- 35.5 For students age 16 or younger, if appropriate, the IEP does not describe a coordinated set of transition activities.

- 35.6 For students age 16 or younger, if appropriate, the IEP does not state the interagency responsibilities or any needed linkages to implement transition activities.
- 36.0 The IEP team does not reconvene to identify alternative strategies to meet the transition objectives when a participating agency other than the district fails to provide transition services.
- 45.1 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing that the disability is not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing the observations of relevant behavior of the student that have been made by one team member other than the child's teacher (in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment).
- 77.0 Parents are not provided written notice in a reasonable time.
- 78.1 The district notification does not contain a description of the action proposed or refused.
- 78.2 The district's notification does not include an explanation of why the district proposes or refuses to take the action.
- 78.3 The district notification does not contain a description of any other factors that are relevant to the district's proposal or refusal.
- 78.3 The district's notification does not provide a description of any other option the agency considered and the reason why those options were rejected.
- 78.5 The district's notification does not provide a description of any other factors that are relevant to the district's proposal or refusal.
- 78.7 The district's notification does not provide sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of the procedural safeguards.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance**

#### **History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Item Findings**

**Date(s) 5/9-11/00**

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are three areas continue to be noncompliant and are in process of correction. These items are:

29.2 The IEP team does not include at least one general education teacher of the child (if the child is in or may be participating in general education).

29.2.1 The general education teacher does not participate in the development of the IEP.

36.0 If an invited agency representative cannot attend the IEP meeting to develop transition services, the district does not obtain agency participation in planning for these services.

A reoccurring noncompliant item, as identified in the CCR 1996, is listed below and is being corrected through the current Corrective Action Plan.:

3.0 Record review indicates that documenting classroom modifications conducted prior to special education referral does not consistently occur.

These above items were self-identified by the district in 1999 and were again found noncompliant in the verification review process.

In addition, timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99. The district is in process of correction as of this report. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CCR District Self Review Findings</b> <b>Submitted to CDE July 1, 1999</b></p>
--

<b>Item</b>	<b>Finding</b>	<b>Status: Noncompliant</b>	<b>Date(s) 6/30/00</b>
-------------	----------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

Excluding item #1, all items are addressed in the current Corrective Action Plan.

1 a,b,c,d	The district does not locate and identify all students, 0-21 (including private school students) in need of special education services nor provide documentation available to for parents and school site staff describing the relationship among identification, screen, referral, evaluation, planning, implementation, review and the three year reevaluation. Documentation does not include a written notice to all parents of their procedural safeguards nor is there a written procedure for initiating a referral for evaluation to determine eligibility for special education.
-----------	---

- 29.2 The IEP team does not include at least one general education teacher of the child (if the child is in or may be participating in general education).
- 29.2.1 The general education teacher does not participate in the development of the IEP.
- 36.0 If an invited agency representative cannot attend the IEP meeting to develop transition services, the district does not obtain agency participation in planning for these services.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)**5/9-11/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Eleven (11) student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE.

The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of school and district calendars
- Review of contractor billing records
- Review of service logs
- In person interviews with administrators including site principals, special education teachers and service providers including psychologists and counselors.
- Review of district policies and procedures regarding IEP implementation
- In person interview and telephone interviews with parents

### **FINDINGS**

1. One parent reported that her child was not receiving speech and language services consistently as stated on the IEP. This was rectified immediately by the district once made aware of the problem.
2. The majority of parents (8-9) reported that their children were receiving services as stated on IEPs and that they were pleased with the child's special education program. Parents stated that the school district was supportive, responsive, open and friendly to parents and that they are welcome at school at all times.

### **CONCLUSION**

No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation. For selected students, IEPs are implemented as written.

**Norwalk La Mirada Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	Not reported in aggregate	District currently working on data collection and remedy District provided revised dates of IEPs for CASEMIS corrections due June 15, 2000.
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	Not reported in aggregate	District currently working on data collection and remedy District provided revised dates of IEPs for CASEMIS corrections due June 15, 2000.
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b> Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services</b>	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

<b>District</b>	<b>Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count</b>	<b># Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines</b>	<b># Students not receiving Reevaluation within</b>	<b>Percentage % Students not receiving timely</b>
-----------------	---------------------------------	---	---	---

		<b>COMPLIANT</b>	<b>timelines NONCOMPLIANT</b>	<b>reevaluations</b>
<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD</b>	2, 257	2, 021	236	10.5%

### **Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs

Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)

December, 1999 Pupil Count

#### **Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

<b>District</b>	<b>Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count</b>	<b># Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT</b>	<b># Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT</b>	<b>Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews</b>
<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD</b>	2,257	1, 521	736	32.6%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### NORWALK LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 7/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1991, 1996 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1991, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –3 NC Resolved	6/30/00	None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 6 NC Resolved, 2 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <i>CDE FMTA consultant met with Norwalk USD June 27-28, 2000 onsite to review all noncompliant findings including prior areas of noncompliance, if any, verification review findings for student records and IEP</i>		

<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Site staff to document attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral for special education)</p>	3.0	<p><i>implementation. Corrective actions are in discussion at the time of this June 30, 2000 report and may change to address each and every area of identified noncompliance.</i></p> <p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to documenting attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral to special education</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding documenting attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral to special education</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have considered for special education referral, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide written notice to parents that child is being considered for special education referral)</p>	4.0	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to provision of a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide evaluation plan to that include alternative assessment, as appropriate)</p>	5.8	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parents with an evaluation plan that contains all required components.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding evaluation plan that contains all of the required contents.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00



<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct hearing and vision screening)	7.0	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to vision and hearing screening.</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)	10.0	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include statement of validity and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used & <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting & <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or	12.2 12.3 12.6 12.8	<p>This corrective action encompasses items 12.2, 12.3, 12.6, 12.8 listed left.</p> <p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to all required components for written evaluation reports</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00

economic disadvantage)				
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of eligibility to parent)	13.0	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing a copy of the evaluation report to the parent and documentation of eligibility determination.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing a copy of the evaluation report to the parent and documentation of eligibility determination.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation conducted in a timely manner and include additions or modifications to special education and related services needed to enable the child to meet measurable annual goals; review information provided by the parent)	15.0 15.2 16.2	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of the child's present levels of performance including how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum; show a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the education goals and	20.1 20.3 20.5	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00

<p>benchmarks; Include a statement of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to the child to enable the child to progress in the general curriculum)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress)</p>	20.7	<p>information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests)</p>	20.8	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or district-wide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to</p>	20.12	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00

the student upon turn 18 at least one year prior to turning age 18)		initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have turned 17 years of age and who have had an IEP meeting since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	
<b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual review )	24.0	<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>IEP</b> (Review progress toward previous annual goals and benchmarks and in the general curriculum when developing new goals & benchmarks)	24.1	<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher)	29.2	<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00

		eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00		
<b>IEP</b> (Include child, when appropriate or when the IEP meeting will be considering post secondary transition)	29.8	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to supporting the transition of students from special class or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to the general education classroom in the public school</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to supporting the transition of students from special class or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to the general education classroom in the public school</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP meetings that included discussion of post secondary transitions since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include all requirements for transition students age 14 and age 16)	34 35.5 35.6 36	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to transition requirements for students age 14 and age 16.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to transition requirements for students age 14 and age 16.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students , ages 14-16 years of age, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, Include observations in an appropriate setting by a team member other than child's teacher	45.2	<p><b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to evaluation and eligibility determination for student with specific learning</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00

<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Provide prior written notice including description of action proposed or refused; an explanation of why the district proposes or refused to take the action); a description of any other options that they district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected; a description of any other factors that are relevant to the district's proposal or refusal; and sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provision of the procedural safeguards.)	77.0 78.1 78.2 78.3 78.5 78.7	disabilities 4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
		<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to provision of prior written notice to parents 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00		
<b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs Reevaluation</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b> See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99 Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other		-0- Noncompliance Identified -0- Noncompliance Identified -0- Noncompliance Identified -0- Noncompliance Identified	None required None required None required None required	Compliant 5/9-11/00 Same as above Same as above Same as above
<b>Transition</b>		<b>Noncompliant: See Corrective Actions items 34, 35.5, 35.6, 36</b>	See Corrective Actions for items 34, 35.5, 35.6, 36	Noncompliant 5/9-11/00
<b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 5/9-11/00
<b>Students-long</b>		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Same as above

term suspension expulsions				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

*CDE Monitor: Betty Carr, Consultant, Telephone: 916/322-9578 email: [bcarr@cde.ca.gov](mailto:bcarr@cde.ca.gov), FAX: 916/327-8878, Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814*

**Summary Review of Selected Districts: Section A**  
**QAP with Disabilities**  
**Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students**  
**Annual IEP Reviews and Three Year Reevaluations**

**District Self-Reports: Students Not Receiving Services**

District	Annual IEP Reviews CASEMIS 12/1/99	District Self Report 6/12/00 Annual IEPs		3 Year Reevaluations CASEMIS 12/1/99	District Self Report 6/12/00 Reevaluations	
Sweetwater Union HSD	669	0		580	0	
San Diego USD	1655	Final CDE report to OSEP 2/28/99  1082	6/12/00  3296	741	Final CDE report to OSEP 2/28/99  1082	6/12/00  1393
Lynwood USD	515	No data provided to CDE		325	No data provided to CDE	
Antelope Valley HSD	519	30		260	40	
Fremont USD	398	438		217	108	
W. Contra Costa USD	1069	364		905	862	
Garden Grove USD	804	726		40	411	
Modesto Elementary SD	280	52		289	64	
Norwalk La Mirada USD	736	No aggregate data provided to CDE		236	No aggregate data provided to CDE	

**Summary Review of Selected Districts: Section A**  
**QAP**  
**Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students with Disabilities**  
**Related Services**  
**District Self-Reports: Students Not Receiving Services**

District	OT	PT	SLH	Counseling	Transition Services	Suspension 10 days +	Expulsion	Supplementary Aids & Services
<b>Sweetwater Union HSD</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>San Diego USD</b>	2/28/99 1  6/12/00 0	2/28/99 0  6/12/00 14	2/28/99 306  6/12/00 0	2/28/00 0	2/28/99 Trained 5, 903	2/28/99 Not required for reporting	2/28/99 Not required for reporting	2/28/99 Not required for reporting
<b>Lynwood USD</b>	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE	No data provided to CDE
<b>Antelope Valley HSD</b>	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	0
<b>Fremont USD</b>	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
<b>W. Contra Costa USD</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Garden Grove USD</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Modesto Elementary SD</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Norwalk La Mirada USD</b>	0	0	0	0	0 reported Identified Noncompliant Systemic Verification Review 5/9-11/00	0	0	0



<p><b>B. CDE Monitoring and Supervision of FedCAP Districts Found Noncompliant by OSEP Monitoring Reports in 1996 and 1999</b></p>
--

The **FedCAP** districts include:

- Alvord Unified School District
- Antioch Unified School District
- California Youth Authority (Ventura School)
- Capistrano Unified School District
- Enterprise Elementary School District
- Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District
- Holtville Unified School District
- Long Beach Unified School District
- Los Angeles County Schools (Court Schools)
- Los Angeles Unified School District
- Mt. Diablo Unified School District
- Saddleback Valley Unified School District
- San Diego Unified School District
- San Francisco Unified School District
- San Pasqual Unified School District

1. **CDE will demonstrate that it has ensured that the Fed CAP districts are in compliance in the areas described in OSEP's 1996 and 1999 California Monitoring Reports and can provide data that show positive impact on services to children with disabilities (like the district-specific data that CDE submitted in response to the 1996 Corrective Action Plan):**

**These areas include:**

- Current Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)
  - Transition
  - Related Services
  - FAPE: Students suspended/expelled
  - Least Restrictive Environment; and
  - Reevaluations
2. **CDE will demonstrate that it has used the Quality Assurance Process, as necessary, to ensure systemic compliance (including a verification review for each of the FedCAP districts).**
  3. **CDE will demonstrate that it takes enforcement action to ensure compliance when other actions have not ensured compliance**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides the following:**

- a. The specific areas of continuing noncompliance, including, for each, specific data regarding the number of children not receiving services to which they are entitled under Part B as reported by the LEA (district) and validated by CDE;

- b. The required corrective actions, including specific activities and timelines;
- c. The current status of those corrective actions and of compliance, including whether children are receiving needed services and any evidence from parents that corrective action has occurred; and
- d. The specific additional actions that CDE has taken or will take, including but not limited to follow-up data collection, technical assistance, and sanctions to secure compliance/correction, and the date on which CDE took or by which CDE will take each such action.

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides required documentation on the following 6 selected districts:**

- Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District
- Mt. Diablo Unified School District
- Holtville Unified School District
- Los Angeles Unified School District
- San Francisco Unified School District
- Saddleback Unified School District

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE has completed a verification process review of all FedCAP districts.**

<b>FedCAP District</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Review Date</b>
San Diego Unified School District	Completed	March 20-21, 2000
Antioch Unified School District	Completed	March 28-29, 2000
Mt. Diablo Unified School District	Completed	March 30-31, 2000
Los Angeles Unified School District	Completed	April 6-7, 2000
San Francisco Unified School District	Completed	April 5-7, 2000
Enterprise Elementary School District	Completed	April 11-12, 2000
Holtville Unified School District	Completed	April 17-18, 2000
California Youth Authority (Ventura School)	Completed	April 17-18, 2000
San Pasqual Unified School District	Completed	April 19-20, 2000
Los Angeles County Court Schools	Completed	April 25-27, 2000
Long Beach Unified School District	Completed	May 1-3, 2000
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	Completed	May 16-17, 2000
Alvord Unified School District	Completed	May 24-25, 2000
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	Completed	May 25-26, 2000
Capistrano Unified School District	Completed	June 5-7, 2000

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>FAIRFIELD-SUISUN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
---

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>OAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	10/99	Compliant	None	10/99
<b>CCR:</b>	1991	Compliant	None-10 NC Resolved	1991
<b>CCR:</b>	1998	Noncompliant	1 NC	1998
<b>CCR</b>	Not due			
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Compliant	4 NC Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	1 Decision/Order		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on May 16-17, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/16-17/00
3.0	Record review indicates that documenting classroom modifications conducted prior to special education referral.	
4.0	Review of records indicates that documenting assessment procedures such as: written notices to parents informing them that their child is being considered for special education; documenting that parents were provided with an assessment plan which includes the reason for assessment; type of assessment and person conducting the assessment and, documenting that assessments include consideration of parental information; IQ tests that are not in violation of state law and conducted within legal timelines.	
5.0	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.	
5.1	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan that includes the reason for assessment.	
5.2	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan that includes the a description of the type of evaluation, materials and procedures.	
5.3	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan that includes type of assessment and person conducting the assessment	
5. 4	The need to assess students in their primary language and monitor their English Language Development and indicate language proficiency level such and LEP or FEP.	
5.5	The district's evaluation plan does not include a statement that tests and other evaluation materials will be provided and administered in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication, and if not, the reason why it is clearly not feasible, including any independent evaluation.	
5.6	A review of records indicates that documenting procedures in the district's evaluation plan does not include a statement that tests and other evaluation materials including any recent evaluations, and independent evaluation.	
5.7	A review of records indicates that documenting procedures in the district's evaluation plan does not include information the parent requests to be considered.	

- 5.9 A review of records indicates that documenting procedures in the district's evaluation plan does not include parent consent and date.
- 7.0 A review of records indicates the need to document vision and hearing screening as part of the initial and three-year evaluations.
- 9.0 A review a records reveals that signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.
- 12.2 The evaluation does not contain a statement regarding validity of the evaluation
- 12.3 The evaluation does not include findings whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.
- 12.7 The evaluation does not include educationally relevant health, developmental and medical findings, if any.
- 12.8 The evaluation does not include the determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 13.0 A review of records indicates that parents are not provided a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination.
- 15.0 LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).
- 20. 7 Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 29.2 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher, student, or other required participants at IEP meetings.
- 35.6 IEPs do not state the interagency responsibilities or any needed linkages to implement transition activities.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing the observations of relevant behavior of the student that have been made by one team member other than the child's teacher (in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment).

## **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance**

### **History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

### **Findings**

**Date(s)** 5/16-17/00

Review of prior Fed CAP areas of noncompliance, CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified.

1. Fairfield Suisun USD continues to have systemic noncompliance in completing three year reevaluations in a timely fashion. This is evidenced through CASEMIS data of 12/1/99. The district self report of 6/12/00 demonstrates substantial progress of compliance improvement in this area. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.
2. Provision of mental health services remains an area still in need of corrective action. Coordination between County Mental Health and the Fairfield Suisun USD needs improvement. This area is addressed on a county and state level through interagency agreement.
3. Occupational therapy services are not always made available. Fairfield Suisun USD is addressing this problem with improved and well-communicated intake procedures for district staff.
4. Other than the related services listed above, the remaining FedCAP items are compliant (see below)
  - Procedural Safeguards
  - Related Services – physical therapy
  - IEP: Statement of specific special education and related services

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

### **Findings**

**Date(s)** 5/16-6/16/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services,

suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of service logs
- Student/staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents, teachers and service providers
- In person interview with administrators

## **FINDINGS**

1. A general education teacher did not attend an IEP meeting.
2. One parent stated that the school failed to provide the agreed upon anger management training as part of the behavior management plan written on the student's IEP. This area is being explored further with the Fairfield Suisun's Director of Special Education.
3. Seven (7) of the ten (10) parents interviewed reported satisfaction with the special education program. They indicated their involvement in the IEP process and ongoing educational program and thought their child was making progress as a result of special education.

## **CONCLUSION**

As a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation, procedural noncompliances were discovered and are addressed in the Corrective Action Plan. Nine of the ten students selected for the IEP implementation review and focused types of services receive those services as stated on their IEPs. The district is systemically compliant in providing the services to students with disabilities according to their IEPs.

**Fairfield Suisun Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Local Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	14	Continuing corrective action plans for compliance complaints S-0-237-98/99, S-0017/98/99 and S-005/98-99 address annual IEPs and three year reevaluations. The district continues following the CDE Corrective Action Plan which is working in reducing/eliminating noncompliance re: timely annual review IEPs. Student names, Parent names and telephone numbers provided to CDE as required.
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	10	Same as above
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving needed</b>	0	

related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)		
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluations within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluations within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Fairfield Suisun USD	2, 758	2,707	51	1.8%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Fairfield Suisun USD	2, 758	2, 678	80	2.9%



# Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

## FAIRFIELD SUISUN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 10/99
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1991, all NC Resolved, 1998 1 NC		1998 1 NC CDE follow up Monitor	Compliant 1992 Noncompliant 1998
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	Not due		None required	None required
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 4 NC Resolved		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic Identification &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Item #</b>  4.0	<b>Verification Review –Student Records : Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b>  9/30/00 Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports included all required contents; Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00

(written notice of referral to parents)		Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation plan within 15 days)	5.0	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation than contains all of the required contents. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include personnel listed by title and evaluation area; individuals primary language and language proficiency status for English Language Learners; statement that tests and other evaluation materials will be provided in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication; recent evaluations, including any available independent evaluations; consider information parent requests; alternative means as appropriate; include parent consent & date)	5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.9	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation <b>that contains all of the required contents</b> ; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation than contains all of the required contents. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Vision and hearing screening)	7.0	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Signed evaluation plan resulting in an IEP within 50 days)	9.0	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within fifty days of obtaining written parental consent to an evaluation; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the timelines for completing IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include validity statement and that tests are valid for intended purposes)	12.2 12.3	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include educationally relevant health,	12.7 12.8	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports	CDE review of evidence required	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00

developmental and medical findings, if any; and determination of effects of environment, cultural, or economic disadvantage )		including all required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide parents a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination)	13.0	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility determination; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility determination; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (3 year)	15.0	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<b>IEP</b> (Statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.)	20.7	<b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00

<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether their child will take district or statewide achievement tests.)</p>	<p>20.8</p>	<p>related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or districtwide achievement tests, using alternative assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the child's IEP; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or districtwide achievement tests, using alternative assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the child's IEP; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 5/16-17/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher in the IEP)</p>	<p>29.2</p>	<p><b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the participation of general education teachers in the IEP; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 5/16-17/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Transition requirements) (State the interagency responsibilities or any needed linkages to</p>	<p>35.6</p>	<p><b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the transition needs of students beginning at age 16, including the development and review of the IEP and the provision of a coordinated set of transition activities;</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	<p>Noncompliant 5/16-17/00</p>

<p><b>implement the transition activities)</b></p> <p><b>IEP</b> (For students with SLD, IEPs certify that observations of the student's behavior have been made by a team member other than the child's teacher)</p>	45.2	<p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures regarding the transition needs and transition IEPs of students beginning at age 16; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who are 16 years or older and who have become eligible for a triennial review, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Fairfield Suisun USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with learning disabilities; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 5/16-17/00
<p><b>Verification Review-Annual IEPs Reevaluation</b></p> <p><b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other</p> <p><b>Transition</b></p> <p><b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b></p> <p><b>Students-long term suspension Expulsions</b></p>		<p><b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b> See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance Identified</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance Identified</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance Identified</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance Identified</p>	<p>See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>Noncompliant 12/1/99 &amp; 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99 &amp; 6/12/00 Compliant 5/16-6/16/00</p> <p>Compliant 5/16-6/16/00 Compliant 5/16-6/16/00 Compliant 5/16-6/16/00</p>

**CDE Monitor: Max Forman, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-0378 email: [mforman@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mforman@cde.ca.gov)  
FAX: 916/327-3534 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

**District Compliance Profile  
MT. DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>OAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	10/99	Compliant	None	10/99
<b>CCR:</b>	1991	Compliant	None-8 NC Resolved	1991
<b>CCR:</b>	1994	Compliant	None-8 NC Resolved	1994
<b>CCR</b>	1997	Compliant	None-1 NC Resolved	1997
<b>CCR:</b>	1998	Compliant	None-9 NC Resolved	1998
<b>(Self Review)</b>	Not due			
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	36 NC Resolved, 9 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	1 Decision/Order		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**  
**Conducted by CDE on March 30-31, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 3/30-31/00
5.0	The district does not consistently provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components	
7.0	All students who are evaluated for an initial or three year reevaluation do not receive a hearing and vision screening unless parental permission is denied.	
9.0	The district does not consistently develop IEPs within 50 days of written parental consent.	
10.0	Written evaluations do not consistently include information related to enabling the child to be involved in the general education program.	
10.2	IQ tests are sometimes administered to African-American students.	
12.2and 12.3	Written evaluations do not consistently include a statement of validity of the evaluation for any population for which validity may be a factor.	
12.5 and12.6	Evaluation reports do not consistently include information about whether the student's needs can be met in the regular classroom	
15.0	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).	
20.6	IEPs do not include and explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.	
20.8	IEPs do not consistently include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.	
24.0	The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP.	
24.1	IEPs do not consistently include information regarding the student's progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks in the general curriculum.	



- 33.0 When student transfer into the general education classroom from special education classes or centers, the IEP team does not provide for transitioning.
- 45.1 (For students determined to have a specific learning disability), IEPs do not consistently include a statement that the disability is not the result of a vision, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

In addition to the review of approximately 75 student records, a review of the district's compliance history, prior Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) issues of noncompliance, complaint issues or due process findings from the previous four years was conducted to determine if the problems continue to be resolved.

The reoccurring noncompliances that were noted in this review are:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 3/30-31/00
15.0	The district does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date this is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous evaluation). Noncompliance evidence also found in CASEMIS data, 12/1/99 and district self-report submitted to CDE on 6/12/00.	
24.0	The IEP team does not periodically review, but not less than annually, the student's IEP. Noncompliance evidence also found in CASEMIS data, 12/1/99 and district self-report submitted to CDE on 6/12/00.	

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 3/30-4/19/00
-----------------	-----------------------------

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Eleven student records were reviewed extensively for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked in the areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted as part of the verification review:

- Review of student's IEPs

- Review of service logs
- Review of staff time sheets
- Student/staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents, teachers, and service providers
- Telephone interview with one student
- In person interview with administrators

## FINDINGS

1. One noncompliance was discovered as a result of these reviews. An African American student was given a psychological assessment. This area is addressed in the Corrective Action Plan.
2. Observations, interviews, and record review indicate that all students receive services as stated on their IEPs.

## CONCLUSION

No noncompliant findings identified regarding implementation of the selected student's IEPs.

**Mt.Diablo Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**  
 Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

Compliance Area for Students:	Number of Students	District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance
Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)	384	See following narrative below  District provided to CDE the Special Education Department Proposed Reorganization which include: Position Addition/Change, Annual Cost of Salary & Benefits, Funding Source (Lottery), Bargaining unit, Rationale.
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	121	See following narrative below  District provided to CDE the Special Education Department Proposed Reorganization which include: Position Addition/Change, Annual Cost of Salary & Benefits, Funding Source (Lottery), Bargaining unit, Rationale.
Not receiving needed transition services	0	
Not receiving needed related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10	0	

days or more)		
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**Efforts to return Mt. Diablo Unified School District to compliance in Special Education consist of the following corrective actions:**

**REORGANIZATION OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: Board Approved June 1999 and February 2000**

- Hired the following staff-Assistant Superintendent for Special Education, Director of Special Education, Program Specialist, Psychologist Intern, Senior Secretary
- Increased to full time-2 Program Administrators
- Placed Student Services Department under the direction and purview of the Assistant Superintendent of Special Education in order to better coordinate and improve services in the areas of attendance, health, intervention and discipline. The Director of Student Services will not also oversee Section 504 issues.

**ADDITIONAL STAFFING REQUIREMENTS TO ADDRESS SPECIFIC NON-COMPLIANCE ISSUES: Board Approved February 2000**

- Created an Alternative Diagnostic Team
  - .5 FTE Nurse
  - .4 FTE Psychologist
  - 1.0 FTE Psychologist Intern
  - .2 FTE Elementary Resource Specialist
  - .2 FTE Secondary Resource Specialist
  - .2 Elementary Speech Pathologist
  - .2 Secondary Speech Pathologist

This team will be on call to provide comprehensive assessments as needed. The intent is to provide an alternative assessment process, to that generally available in schools, as a vehicle for resolving disputes or issues regarding assessment. It will be used to provide second opinion assessments, specialized assessments beyond those typically available in schools, and assessments required through mediation, due process or complaints.

- Established a 3 Year Re-evaluation Team
  - 1 Elementary Resource Specialist
  - 1 Secondary Resource Specialist
  - 2 Psychologists
  - 1 Program Specialist

This team will work through the summer to provide psycho-educational and speech and language assessment for students whose 3 Year Re-evaluations and Administrative Interim Placement evaluations were not completed during the regular school year. The intent is to eliminate overdue 3 Year Re-evaluations and incomplete Administrative Interim Placements.

### **ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO ADDRESS AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION**

- Drafted and presented a document in collaboration with our Community Advisory Committee (CAC), special education staff, general education partners, and school board members that outlines the vision and mission to renew special education in the district. This document contains specific corrective action plans that address our areas of non-compliance.
- Joined other SELPAs to set up Alternative Dispute Resolution and solutions panels. Sent eight special education staff members to facilitated IEP training.
- Presented a Community Forum on June 5, 2000 to address publicly the community's concerns with regard to special education issues. An expert panel consisting of representatives from the California Department of Education, legal community, SELPA Directors, Superintendent's Council, CAC and Special Education administration was assembled to answer questions posed by the audience.
- A knowledgeable expert and trainer presented training and staff development on 3/22/00 and 4/19/00 to site administrators and 3/7/00 to parents on IEP compliance, problem solving, and improved school to home communication.

### **CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

#### **Three year (3) Reevaluation**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

#### **Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluations within timelines  <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Reevaluations within timelines  <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Mt. Diablo USD	5, 080	4, 664	416	8.2%

## Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Mt. Diablo USD	5,080	4,436	644	12.7%

**Corrective Action Plan (CAP)**

**MT. DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 10/99
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1991, 1994, 1998 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	Not due		NA	NA
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 36 NC Resolved, 9 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Written notice provided to	<b>Item #</b>  5.0	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b> <b>Mt. Diablo USD t must provide evidence that it has:</b>  1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws related to providing the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/00	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00

parent within 15 days of referral)		<p>administrators. 1/1/00</p> <p>4. <b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will provide CDE with a list of students who have been referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family, including address and telephone numbers. 1/1/01</p> <p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will develop and implement a log of written referrals and dates that evaluation plans are sent to parents. 7/1/00</p> <p>1. Design log 7/1/00</p> <p>2. Design collection procedure 7/1/00</p> <p>3. Inservice Program Specialists 10/1/00</p> <p>4. Inservice site administrators and teaching staff regarding logging procedures 10/15/00</p> <p>5. Send list of students referred for special education between 10/15/00 and 1/1/2001 to CDE 10/15/00-1/1/01</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 1/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 &amp; possible survey of parents</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01 and possible survey of parents</p>	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Vision and hearing screenings)	7.0	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will provide ten (10) evaluations reports written between 10/30/00 and 1/31/2001 that reflect hearing and vision screenings.</p> <p>1. Establish evaluation report collection and review procedures. 7/1/00</p> <p>2. Inservice program specialists 8/31/00</p> <p>3. Inservice site staff 10/15/00</p> <p>4. Collect ten (10) evaluation reports between 10/30/00 and 1/1/2001 and send to CDE 1/31/01</p>	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (IEPs are completed within 50 days of written parent consent)	9.0	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will develop and implement a log that demonstrates timelines from written consent to IEP development. 7/1/00</p> <p>1. Design log by 7/1/00</p> <p>2. Design collection procedure by 10/1/00</p> <p>3. Inservice Program Specialists by 10/1/00</p> <p>4. Inservice site administrators and teaching staff re: logging procedures by 10/15/00</p> <p>5. Send list of students referred for special education between 10/15/00 and 1/1/2001 to CDE 10/15/00 to 1/1/01</p>	CDE review of evidence required 1/1/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation includes information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)	10.0	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) evaluation reports written between 10/30/00 and 1/31/01 that demonstrate that information related to enabling the child to be involved in the general education program is consistently included. 1/31/01</p>	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (No IQ test to be conducted for	10.2	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will provide copies of assessment reports of African-American students who have been evaluated after October 31, 2000 for initial or 3 year eligibility reevaluations.</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01</p> <p>Follow up may</p>	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00

African American students)		<p>1/31/01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. District special education administration to design training and materials related to written notice by 8/31/00</li> <li>2. District special education administration to provide inservice training to site administrators and special education by 10/15/00</li> <li>3. District special education administration to determine collection method for IEPs requested by CDE/SED 10/15/00</li> <li>4. District special education administration to forward IEPs containing appropriate written notice. 1/31/01</li> </ol>	include random survey of parents	
Identification & Evaluation (Statement of validity & intended purposes)	12.2 12.3	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) evaluation reports written between 10/30/00 and 1/31/01 that include a statement of the validity of the evaluation used for populations for which validity is a factor, and for intended purpose. 1/31/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish evaluation report collection and review procedures by 7/1/00</li> <li>2. Inservice Program Specialists regarding reports including the required information by 8/31/00</li> <li>3. Inservice site staff regarding the required information by 10/15/00</li> <li>4. Collect ten (10) evaluation reports between 10/30/00 and 1/1/01 and send to CDE by 1/31/01</li> </ol>	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
Evaluation (Evaluations reports include whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom & include whether the student needs special education and related services)	12.4	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) evaluation reports written between 10/30/00 and 1/31/01 that include information about whether the student's needs can be met in the regular classroom. 1/31/01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish evaluation report collection and review procedures by 7/1/00</li> <li>2. Inservice Program Specialists regarding reports including the required information by 8/31/00</li> <li>3. Inservice site staff regarding the required information by 10/15/00</li> <li>4. Collect ten (10) evaluation reports between 10/30/00 and 1/1/01 and send to CDE by 1/31/01</li> </ol>	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
IEP (Explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate in the regular class and extracurricular	20.6	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) IEPs developed between 10/30/00 and 1/31/01 that include an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities by 1/31/01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish IEP collection and review procedures 7/1/00</li> <li>2. Inservice Program Specialists regarding reports</li> </ol>	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00



and nonacademic activities.)		including the required information by 8/31/00 3. Inservice site staff regarding the required information by 10/15/00 4. Collect ten (10) IEPs between 10/30/00 and 1/1/01 and send to CDE by 1/31/01		
<b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests)	20.8	<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) IEPs developed between 10/30/00 and 1/31/01 that include statements regarding whether the student will take district or statewide achievement tests by 1/31/01 1. Establish IEP collection and review procedures 7/1/00 2. Inservice Program Specialists regarding reports including the required information by 8/31/00 3. Inservice site staff regarding the required information by 10/15/00 4. Collect ten (10) IEPs between 10/30/00 and 1/1/01 and send to CDE by 1/31/01	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual IEPs in a timely manner)	24.0	<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit/maintain a log that demonstrates that IEPs are held at least annually. 1/31/00 1. Design log by 7/1/00 2. Design procedures by 7/1/00 3. Inservice Program Specialists regarding logging information by 10/1/00 4. Inservice site administrators and teaching staff regarding logging procedures by 10/15/00 5. Send log and data sampling to CDE 1/31/01	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include information regarding the student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks, and in the general curriculum)	24.1	<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) IEPs that have been developed between 10/30/00 and 1/31/01 that demonstrate student's progress toward annual goals, benchmarks and in the general curriculum by 1/31/01 1. Establish IEP collection and review procedures 7/1/00 2. Inservice Program Specialists regarding IEPs including the required information by 8/31/00 3. Inservice site staff regarding the required information by 10/15/00 4. Collect ten (10) IEPs between 10/30/00 and 1/1/01 and send to CDE by 1/31/01	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>IEP</b> (Provide transition activities when students transfer from a special class or center or a NPS to the general education	33.0	<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will provide CDE with a list of students who have transferred after 10/30/00 from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic nonsectarian schools to the general classroom in the public school, along with the IEPs for the students by 1/31/01 1. District special education administration to design training and materials related to transition to general education classrooms in the public school by 8/31/00 2. District special education administration to provide	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00

classroom in the public school)		<p>inservice training to site administrators and special education and general education staff by 10/31/00</p> <p>3. District special education administration to determine collection method for IEPs requested by CDE by 10/15/00</p> <p>4. District special education administration to forward list of students and their IEPs who are transitioning to the general education classroom in the public school by 1/31/01</p>		
<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, include statement that the disability is not the result of a vision, hearing, motor impairment or emotional disturbance)	45.1	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will provide CDE with a list of students and their IEPs that includes a statement that the disability is not the result of a vision, hearing, motor impairment or emotional disturbance by 1/31/00</p> <p>1. District special education administration to design training and materials related to eligibility statements for specific learning disability by 8/31/00</p> <p>2. District special education administration to provide inservice training to site administrators and special education staff by 10/15/00</p> <p>3. District special education administration to determine collection method for IEPs requested by CDE by 10/15/00</p> <p>4. District special education administration to forward list of students to CDE and their IEPs who are found eligible for special education as a student with a specific learning disability by 1/31/01</p>	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written notice to contain all required components)	77.0	<p><b>Mt. Diablo USD</b> will submit ten (10) written notices to CDE that have been sent after October 31, 2000 and contain the required notice of a proposal to initiate or change the identification, assessment, evaluation, or education placement of the student 1/31/00</p> <p>1. District special education administration to design training and materials related to written notice 8/31/00</p> <p>2. District special education administration to provide inservice training to site administrators and special education staff by 10/15/00</p> <p>3. District special education administration to determine collection method for IEPs requested by CDE by 10/15/00</p> <p>4. District special education administration to forward IEPs containing appropriate written notice 1/31/01</p>	CDE review of evidence required 1/31/01 and may include random survey of parents	Noncompliant 3/30-31/00
<b>Verification Review Annual IEPs Reevaluation</b>		<p><b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b></p> <p>See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements</p> <p>See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements</p>	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99 & 6/12/00
<b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling		-0- Noncompliance found 3/30-31/00	None required	Compliant 3/30-4/19/00

Other Transition				
Supplementary Aids & Services		-0- Noncompliance found	3/30-31/00	None required Compliant 3/30-31/00
Students-long term suspension		-0- Noncompliance found	3/30-31/00	None required Compliant 3/30-4/19/00
Expulsions		-0- Noncompliance found	3/30-31/00	None required Compliant 3/30-4/19/00

*CDE Monitor: Mike Hancock, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-3637 email:*

*[mhancock@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mhancock@cde.ca.gov) FAX: 916/327-3534 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270,  
Sacramento, CA. 95814*

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>HOLTVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>QAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1993	Compliant	None-11 NC Resolved	1993
<b>CCR</b>	1996	Compliant	None- 5 NC Resolved	1996
<b>(Self Review)</b>	1999	Not submitted to CDE		
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Compliant	None Filed	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on April 17-18, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>
		4/17-18/00
4.0	LEA does not provide parents with a written notice that their child is being considered for special education referral.	
5.8	Evaluation form does not provide for Alternative means, as appropriate	
9.0	Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
10.0	The evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.	
12.4	Evaluations do no state whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom.	
13.0	Parents are not provided a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination.	
15.0	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).	
20. 5	Students IEPs do not include a description of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.	
20.7	Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.	
20.8	The IEP does not contain a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide assessments.	
20.10	The IEP does not consistently state the frequency, duration and location of the recommended services and modifications.	
24	The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP.	

- 29.2 The IEP team does not include at least one general education teacher of the child (if the child is in or may be participating in general education).
- 45.1 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP does not certify in writing that the disability is not a result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.
- 88.4 The IEP for preschool children does not contain a statement of the program modifications for (pre)school personnel that will be provided for the child.
- 89.0 Each preschool age child's IEP team does not include a least one regular preschool teacher, if the child is, or may be participating in a regular education environment.
- 122.4 The IFSP does not include all persons who will be providing services to the infant or toddler and family as appropriate.
- 126.0 There is limited evidence that the contents of the initial and annual IFSP are fully explained to the parent and a legible copy of the document given to the parent.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)** 4/17-18/00

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration identified evidence of the following systemic recurring areas of noncompliance

1. **Transition IEP meeting notices:** Notices are not consistently used to invite other agency representatives
2. **Parent Notice:** No evidence that parents are consistently informed of referral for special education or assessment.

Corrective actions are written to address these noncompliant items as well as the other items found noncompliant as a result of the verification review process conducted in April, 2000. Evidence of compliance is to be submitted to CDE by the Holtville USD by November 1, 2000.

In addition, timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99. Though reported as self-corrected as of June 12, 2000 and

to be verified by the CASEMIS June 30, 2000 end of year report, CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)** 4/17-18/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of service provider logs
- Student annual progress reports
- Student confidential files
- In person interviews with staff and administrators

### **FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS**

All IEPs reviewed were found to be implemented as written. No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation.

### **Holtville Unified School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	0	District self-corrected and held annual IEPs by the close of the school year. The June 30, 2000 district submitted data to CASEMIS, End of Year Report, will reflect the noncompliance reported compliant as of 6/12/00 to CDE.
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	0	District self-corrected and conducted three year reevaluations by the close of the school year. The June 30, 2000 district submitted data to CASEMIS, End of Year Report, will reflect the noncompliance reported compliant as of 6/12/00 to CDE.
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b>	0	
<b>Occupational therapy</b>		
<b>Physical therapy</b>		

Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)		
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluations within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluations within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Holtville USD	222	213	9	4.1%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s) 12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Holtville USD	222	183	39	17.6%



**HOLTVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1993, 1996 all NC Resolved		None required	Compliant 1992, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 Not submitted to CDE		NA	NA
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00)    -0- NC Identified		None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> <span style="float:right">6/15/00</span> Review and correct data   & Conduct reevaluations for identified students		1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4.Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> <span style="float:right">6/15/00</span> Review and correct data   & Conduct annual reviews for identified students		Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>  <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide written notice to parents that child is being considered for special education referral)	<b>Item #</b>  4.0	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  <b>Holtville USD   must provide evidence that it has:</b> <span style="float:right"><b>9/30/00</b></span>  1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to provision of a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral. 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00

<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide evaluation plan that includes alternative assessment, as appropriate)</p>	<p>5.8</p>	<p>administrators regarding the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> <b>9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to alternative assessment as a means of evaluation that contains all required components. 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the alternative assessment as a means of evaluation that contains all required components. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct IEP within 50 days of written consent)</p>	<p>9.0</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> <b>9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation plan 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation. 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding timelines for completing IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)</p>	<p>10.0</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> <b>9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum. 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>

<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include statement of validity and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used &amp;</p>	<p>12.3 12.4</p>	<p>evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p>This corrective action encompasses items 12.3, 12.4 listed left.</p> <p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to all required components for written evaluation reports</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation)</p>	<p>15.0</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to the child to enable the child to progress in the general curriculum)</p>	<p>20.5</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of supplementary aids and services as well as program modifications and supports for school personnel</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to provision of supplementary aids and services as well as program modifications and supports for school personnel</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>

<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress)</p>	<p>20.7</p>	<p>eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests)</p>	<p>20.8</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or district-wide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include anticipated frequency, duration and location of recommended services and modifications)</p>	<p>20.12</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>

<p><b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual review )</p>	<p>24.0</p>	<p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had an IEP meeting since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Review progress toward previous annual goals and benchmarks and in the general curriculum when developing new goals &amp; benchmarks)</p>	<p>24.1</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher)</p>	<p>29.2</p>	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/17-18/00</p>

<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, Include a statement that the disability is not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance)	45.1	<b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to evaluation and eligibility determination for student with specific learning disabilities 4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Provide prior written notice including description of action proposed or refused (referral for possible special education services)  IEP notices need to include invited agencies for the purposes of transition services	77.0	<b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to provision of prior written notice to parents 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
<b>IEP Preschool</b> (Include statement of the program modifications or supports for preschool personnel that will be provided for the child)	84.0	<b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the program modifications and supports for preschool personnel that will be provided for the child 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to the program modifications and supports for preschool personnel that will be provided for the child to the program modifications and supports for preschool personnel that will be provided for the child 4. Provide CDE with a list of preschool students who have had initial IEPs and annual reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00

<b>IEP Preschool</b> (Include regular preschool teacher if child is, or may be participating in a regular education environment)	89.0	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to including a regular preschool teacher at the preschool child's IEP if the child is, or may be participating in a regular education environment</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to including a regular preschool teacher at the preschool child's IEP if the child is, or may be participating in a regular education environment</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of preschool students who have had initial IEPs and annual reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
<b>IFSP Part C</b> (Include persons who will be providing services to the infant or toddler and family as appropriate)	122.4	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to completing IFSPs (contents, process, timelines and participants) including both annual and periodic reviews)</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to completing IFSPs (contents, process, timelines and participants) including both annual and periodic reviews)</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students , birth to three years of age, who have had an IFSP developed or reviewed since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00
<b>IFSP Part C</b> (Contents of initial and annual IFSPs are fully explained to the parent and a legible copy of the document is given to the parent)	126.0	<p><b>Holtville USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to transition from Early Start to preschool programs under Part B or other programs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to transition from Early Start to preschool programs under Part B or other programs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students , birth to three years of age, who have had an IFSP developed or reviewed since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 4/17-18/00

<b>Verification Review-Annual IEPs</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99 Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Reevaluation</b>		See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements		
<b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 4/17-18/00
<b>Transition</b>		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 4/17-18/00
<b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 4/17-18/00
<b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 4/17-18/00

**CDE Monitor: Shelley Harris, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-4221 email: [sharris@cde.ca.gov](mailto:sharris@cde.ca.gov)  
FAX: 916/327-5233 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**



<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><u>QAP Findings</u></i>	<i><u>Date(s)</u></i>	<i><u>Current Status</u></i>	<i><u>Required Corrective Actions</u></i>	<i><u>Date(s)</u></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	10/97	Compliant	None	10/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1993	Compliant	None-9 NC Resolved	1993
<b>CCR:</b>	1998	Compliant	30 NC Resolved	
		Compliant	9 NC Resolved	2000
<b>CCR:</b>	1999	Compliant	5 NC Resolved	2000
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Compliant	49 NC Resolved	5/10/00
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	116 NC Resolved, 24 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	1 Decision/Order		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on April 6-7, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Items</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>
		4/6-7/00
3.0	Record review indicates that documenting classroom modifications conducted prior to special education referral.	
4.0	Review of records indicates that documenting assessment procedures such as: written notices to parents informing them that their child is being considered for special education; documenting that parents were provided with an assessment plan which includes the reason for assessment; type of assessment and person conducting the assessment and, documenting that assessments include consideration of parental information; IQ tests that are not in violation of state law and conducted within legal timelines.	
5.0	In addition to item 4.0 above, the district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.	
5.1	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan that includes the reason for assessment.	
5.2	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan that includes type of assessment and person conducting the assessment	
5.3	The district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan that includes person conducting the assessment	
5.4	The need to assess students in their primary language and monitor their English Language Development and indicate language proficiency level such and LEP or FEP.	
8.7	The district's evaluation plan does not include a statement that tests and other evaluation materials will be provided and administered in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication, and if not, the reason why it is clearly not feasible, including any independent evaluation.	
8.8	A review of records indicates that documenting procedures in the district's evaluation plan does not include a statement that tests and other evaluation materials including any recent evaluations, and independent evaluation.	
8.9	A review of records indicates that documenting procedures in the district's evaluation plan does not include information the parent requests to be considered.	

- 5.9 A review of records indicates that documenting procedures in the district's evaluation plan does not include parent consent and date.
- 7.0 A review of records indicates the need to document vision and hearing screening as part of the initial and three-year evaluations.
- 8.1 There is no evidence that students are assessed in primary language.
- 8.4 A review of records reveals that documenting assessment procedures do not document that evaluations are performed in all areas related to the suspected disability by a multidisciplinary team.
- 8.7 A review of records reveals that documenting assessment procedures do not document consideration of information and private evaluations by the parent.
- 9.0 A review a records reveals that signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.
- 10.0 A review of records indicates that the evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.
- 10.2 A review of records indicates that the evaluation procedures do not ensure that IQ tests are not administered to African American students.
- 12.0 LAUSD practice is to keep psychological reports at the psychologist center rather than in the student's file. Adequate information to guide instruction was available in the summary of the psychologist's report in the IEP. A new computerized Psychologist Report shell has been developed which is in compliance with state and federal law containing required elements. Evaluations do not result in written report or reports, which include the findings of each evaluation.
- 12.1 Tests are not administered in the student's primary language by qualified personnel
- 12.2 The evaluation does not contain a statement regarding validity of the evaluation
- 12.3 The evaluation does not include findings whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.
- 12.4 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.

- 12.5 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information whether the student needs special education or related services.
- 12.6 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information regarding relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting.
- 12.11 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information regarding the basis for making the determination of eligibility.
- 13.0 A review of records indicates that parents are not provided a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination.
- 15.0 LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).
- 15.2 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information regarding additions or modifications to special education and related services needed to enable the child to meet measurable annual goals.
- 16.1 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information that demonstrates a review of existing data
- 16.2 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information provided by the parent.
- 20.1 Students IEPs do not include a statement of the child's present levels of performance including how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum which is in the process of correction by the LAUSD Special Education Compliance Guide. The guide contains process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the "Chanda Smith Consent Decree" and state findings of noncompliance.
- 20.3 Students IEPs do not demonstrate a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the educational services to be provided and the student's goals and benchmarks.
- 20.5 Students IEPs do not include a description of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.6 Students IEPs do not include a description of child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.

- 20.7 Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 20.8 Students IEPs do not include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests.
- 20.9 Students IEPs do not include the projected date for initiating services and modifications.
- 20.10 Students IEPs do not include the anticipated frequency, duration, and location of the recommended services and modifications.
- 20.11 Students IEPs do not include, as appropriate: extended school year, prevocational/career, vocational or type of physical education information.
- 20.12 Beginning at least one year before the student reaches the age of 18, the students IEPs do not state that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turning 18.
- 21.20 Review of student records indicates that there is a lack of coordination among all education providers, specifically with special day classes.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP.
- 24.1 The IEP team does not review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (short term objectives).
- 20.5 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher, student, or other required participants at IEP meetings.
- 29.4 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher, student, or other required participant at IEP meetings. (*a representative of the district who is qualified to provide or supervise specially designed instruction for children with disabilities, and who is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum and the resources of the district*)
- 29.8 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher, student, or other required participant at IEP meetings. (*the child, when appropriate or when the IEP meeting will be considering postsecondary transition*)

- 33.1 A review of records indicates that documenting present levels of performance, development of measurable goals and benchmarks, and, indicating classroom modifications necessary for the student to progress in the general program. The IEP team does not include a description of activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education program indicating the nature of each activity, and the time spent on the activity each day or week.
- 33.4 A review of records indicates that a description of the activities provided to support the transition of pupils from the special education program into the regular education program.
- 34.0 A review of records indicates that beginning at the age of 14, and updated annually, IEPs do not contain statements about the student's transition from school to post school living needs which focus on course of study such as vocational or advanced placement classes, nor do they reflect at age 16 or younger, if appropriate statements related to the needed transition services and interagency linkages necessary to accomplish post-school goals. Furthermore, if the above referenced statements were evident, they were not a coordinated set of activities based on the student's interests and preferences which include goals, benchmarks or activity statements in the areas of instruction, related services, community experiences, development of employment and other post-school living objectives and, if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation.
- 35.0 Same as above (*for students age 16, if appropriate, the IEP team does not describe a coordinated set of transition activities*)
- 35.5 IEPs do not include a statement of the needed transition services in one or more of the following areas with an explanation in each area in which services were not recommended.
- 35.6 IEPs do not state the interagency responsibilities or any needed linkages to implement transition activities.
- 41.0 For students with limited English proficiency (English language learners (EL), the IEP team does not consider the language needs of the child as such needs related the child's IEP.
- 45.1 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing that the disability is not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing the observations of relevant behavior of the student that have been made by one team member other than the child's teacher (in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment).

- 45.5 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing that the discrepancy cannot be corrected through other regular or categorical services within the regular instructional program.
- 45.6 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing any educationally relevant medical findings.
- 77.0 The district does not notify parents in writing a reasonable time before (prior written notice).
- 78.0 The district notification does not contain a description of the action proposed or refused.
- 78.1.1. If the notification is for an IEP meeting, the notice does not indicate the meeting's purpose (transition, pre-expulsion, change of placement, three year review, etc), the location, the time of the meeting and a list of who will attend.
- 78.1.2 If the notification is for an IEP meeting to discuss transition services, age 14 or older, or if appropriate at younger than 14, the district does notice does not indicate this purpose.
- 78.2 The district's notification does not provide an explanation of why the district proposes or refuses to take the action.
- 78.3 The district's notification does not provide a description of any other option the agency considered and the reason why those options were rejected.
- 78.4 The district's notification does not provide a description of each evaluation procedure, test, record or report the district used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.
- 78.5 The district's notification does not provide a description of any other factors that are relevant to the district's proposal or refusal.
- 78.6 The district's notification does not provide a statement that the parents of a child with a disability have protections under the procedural safeguards of the law, and know the method by which a copy of the document describing the procedural safeguards can be obtained.
- 78.7 The district's notification does not provide a statement of sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of their procedural safeguards.
- 79.0 The district does not provide the parent with a document describing the procedural safeguards available to the parents of a child with a disability when

they ask for it, but at a minimum at: initial referral or evaluation, each notification of an IEP meeting (including IEP meetings held regarding disciplinary actions), each time a child is reevaluated, each time the district requests mediation, each time the district requests a due process hearing.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)**4/6-7/00

A thorough review of current and prior compliance complaint investigations and analysis of findings and noncompliant conclusions are summarized below.

#### Description of Non-Compliant Finding

- An emerging trend for noncompliance in the are of failure to provide behavior intervention plans for students enrolled in Nonpublic schools (5 CCR 3052 (i)(2))
- Failure to implement the Individualized Education Program (IEP), EC 56345 9c) and 5 CCR 3040 (a) specifically in regarding to Designated Instruction and Services (DIS) specifically in the areas of speech, language and hearing services and occupation therapy services
- Failure to complete an evaluation and hold an IEP within 50 days of the signed consent of the parent (EC 56344) specifically related to assistive technology

Corrective Actions for these findings are stated in the Corrective Action Plan

LAUSD has made measurable progress in providing timely reevaluations and improving in timelines for annual reviews. However, these items remain noncompliant as evidenced by CASEMIS data of 12/199 and district self-report of 6/12/00.

As evidenced in compliance complaint investigations and district self-report of 6/12/00, LAUSD has considerable noncompliance in providing related services of speech, language and hearing services as well as occupational therapy. District self-report also indicates lack of FAPE –services to identified students suspended 10 days or more and issues of LRE regarding supplementary aids and services to identified students.

Note LAUSD’s corrective actions as well as CDE’s corrective actions to ensure compliance.



<p align="center"><b>CCR District Self Review Findings</b>  <b>Submitted to CDE July 1, 1999</b></p>
--

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Status: Compliant</b>	<b>Date(s) 5/10/00</b>
-------------	-----------------	--------------------------	------------------------

1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18N, 19, 21A, 21B, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30,

33, 34A, 34B, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53A,

3B, 54, 55, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63 66

Noncompliant items self-identified by Los Angeles USD were reviewed and cleared by CDE based on ongoing evidence provided by the district demonstrating compliance.

**Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s) May-June/00**

**METHOD OF REVIEW**

Twelve (12) student records were selected from the verification review sample for verification of IEP implementation. The records selected were both elementary and secondary level and collectively had IEPs that indicated related services (OT, counseling, adaptive P.E. and speech, language, hearing therapy). Two (2) secondary files were selected to review transition service language in the IEP. As psychologists reports were not available during the onsite verification review process (student records), six (6) current psychological reports were reviewed during this later phase of the review.

Several methods were used to verify delivery of service. CDE extensively reviewed the students IEPs. CDE then conducted a comparison of LAUSD's database of related services with IEP's to determine if the service, frequency, duration and location of service delivery matched the IEP. Following these activities, interviews were held with parents to verify if the service indicated on the IEP and related service data base were actually being delivered.

Interviews were held with 7 of the 12 parents of students selected and one secondary student. Four families were not available for interview and messages were left twice for parents on their home answering machine asking for a response.

**FINDINGS**

1. The district database on related services matched 10 of the 10 IEPs reviewed.
2. Interviews were held with 7 of the 12 parents of students selected and one secondary student. Four families were not available for interview and messages were left twice for parents on their home answering machine asking for a response.

3. The six of the parents interviewed reported satisfaction with the special education program and indicated involvement in the IEP process and their child's ongoing education program. They also stated that they thought their child was making progress as a result of special education.
4. One parent indicated dissatisfaction with his child's academic progress though he indicated that the district had been "very helpful and tried several things to help." This parent had removed the student from the public school and placed him in a private school last year in which the student demonstrated even less progress. The parent reported that a special IEP meeting had been called by the school to review the student's continued lack of progress and develop plans. Although concerned about his child's lack of progress, the parent said he felt LAUSD was working with the family to develop strategies for academic improvement.
5. One (1) student was interviewed to determine if the Behavior Support Plan, counseling and career/vocational services indicated in his IEP were being delivered and effective. The student indicated that he was aware of the behavior strategies developed in his IEP and reported that he had no recent referrals to the office and was "doing better." He confirmed seeing the school psychologist weekly at school as was able to see her on an emergency basis if need. He is currently enrolled in a career/vocational class (CATS) and reported taking vocational assessments, learning how to complete a job application and had been given job referrals. He does not currently have a work experience but says the school is working on a summer job for him. When asked to rate his special education program on a scale of 1 to 10, 1 being least helpful, he gave the rating of 8.

## CONCLUSION

The IEP implementation review of selected students indicated no items of noncompliance. From parent and student interviews, there appears to be a high level of parent/student satisfaction with the special education program. Related services are delivered according to the IEP. Parents indicated LAUSD's willingness to go beyond the IEP requirements to provide a free appropriate public education. In addition, parents stated that they received support in the form of training and encouragement to be involved.

However, district self report indicates serious systemic issues relating to the provision of speech and language services, occupational therapy, FAPE for students suspended 10 days or more and provision of supplementary aids and services. In addition, speech and language services and occupation therapy services constitute a large quantity of the compliance complaint investigations conducted by CDE.

These areas are addressed in the current Corrective Action Plan in addition to emerging areas of noncompliance in which students placed in Nonpublic schools do not behavior intervention plans or behavior support plans implemented or designed to address their unique needs.

**Los Angeles Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Item 1</b> Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)	1, 985	See narrative below
<b>Item 2</b> Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	123	See narrative below
<b>Item 3</b> Not receiving needed transition services	^Not available	See narrative below
<b>Item 4</b> Not receiving needed related services		
a. Occupational therapy	137	See narrative below
b. Physical therapy	*0	None
c. Speech and language therapy	1,917	See narrative below
d. Counseling	*0	None
e. Other(s)	0	None
<b>Item 5</b> Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	36	See narrative below
<b>Item 6</b> Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	**0	None
<b>Item 7</b> Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	84	See narrative below

^ This information is not currently tracked. However, according to the Administrator, Career and Transition Services (CATS) Program, every student with an ITP calling for CATS personnel to provide service is receiving that service.

\* According to the Administrator of the Program, every student with an IEP for this service is being served.

\*\* The Special Education Specialist, AB 922 At-Risk Student Intervention Unit, indicates that all students with disabilities who are in the expulsion process are receiving required services.

**Local Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students with Disabilities  
LAUSD Designed Corrective Action Plan**

<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b><u>No. of Students</u></b>
<b>#1: Without Current IEPs (Number of Past Due Annual IEPs):</b>	<b>1,985</b>
<b>#2: Not Receiving a Reevaluation Within 3 Years (Number of Past Due 3 Year Reevaluations)</b>	<b>123</b>

**District Corrective Action**

The District is implementing several activities to ensure overall compliance including timeline compliance. These activities include:

1. The implementation of a required annual Special Education Self-Review at every District school, which includes reviewing compliance with timeline requirements. (To begin September, 2000)
2. The publication and dissemination of a *Special Education Compliance Guide* that contains the District's policies and procedures for achieving compliance with special education laws and regulations. The guide includes the requirement to maintain rosters to track and adhere to timelines for compliance (Distributed to site principals and school site training teams from March through June, 2000)
3. A District-wide professional development program on the *Special Education Compliance Guide* which includes training of every principal and school site training team from each school to train its staff about timelines (Began March 2000 and completed June 2000).
4. The addition of an Assistant Principal, Elementary Instructional Specialist (AP, EIS) at every District elementary school to ensure special education compliance, including timeline compliance. (Process began in February 2000 with the placement of 59 AP, EISs). This activity also includes regular ongoing professional development to support the position.
5. The provision of special education professional development for all secondary Assistant Principals to support the achievement of special education compliance standards, including adherence to timelines (Scheduled for July and August 2000).
6. The establishment of the Special Education Compliance Department (August, 1998) to train staff and measure and monitor special education compliance, including adherence to timelines, throughout the District (18 Compliance Specialists are employed to date, with a total of 32 to be in place by July 2000).
7. The implementation of a District Validation Review Process that includes an on site special education review of each school by the District Validation Review team every four years, including a review of timeline compliance (Process began in 1997).
8. (For Item #2) The funding of additional School Psychologist positions to participate in the 3 year reevaluation process (Board approved, March 1999)
- 9.0 (For Item #2) The conversion of all Senior Psychologist positions and 50% of School Psychologist positions to year-round basis to increase the number of psychologists available to participate in the 3 year reevaluation process (Completed July 1999)
10. (For Item #2) The provision of mandated (Chanda Smith Consent Decree Implementation Plan No.5) annual training for School Psychologists, including timeline responsibilities (March 1999 and ongoing)

**Item****No. of Students****# 3: Not Receiving Needed Transition Services  
(Ages 14 and 16)****Data not available****Corrective Action**

The district is implementing several activities to ensure overall compliance including compliance with the provision of Transition Services to eligible students with disabilities. These activities include:

1. The use of a new interim IEP form that triggers the development of an Individual Transition Plan when required. The form is interim so that needed revisions can be made as the interim form is used by staff in the field (Available April 2000/required use by July 2000).
2. The use of a new interim Individual Transition Plan (ITP) that triggers the development of appropriate transition activities/services for students ages 14 and older. (Available April 2000/required use by July 2000).
3. The implementation of a required annual Special Education Self-Review at every District school which includes reviewing IEPs and other records and interviewing staff to ensure that students with disabilities are receiving the transition services indicated on their IEP (To begin September 2000).
4. The publication and dissemination of *the Special Education Compliance Guide* that contains the District's policies and procedures for achieving compliance with special education laws and regulations. It includes mechanisms to assist schools in ensure that that students with disabilities are receiving the transition services indicated on their IEP (Distributed to site principals and school site training teams from March through June 2000).
5. A District-wide professional development program on the Special Education Compliance Guide which includes training of every principal and school site training team from school to train its staff about special education and the requirement to develop a transition plan for students with disabilities 14 years and older (Began March 2000 and completed June 2000).
6. The provision of special education professional development for all secondary Assistant Principals to support the achievement of special education compliance standards, including the provision of transition activities/services to students 14 years and older, throughout the District (Scheduled for July and August 2000).
7. The establishment of the Special Education Compliance Department (August, 1998) to train staff and measure and monitor special education compliance, including the provision of transition activities/services for students ages 14 years and older, throughout the District (18 Compliance Specialists are employed to date, with a total of 32 to be in place by July 2000).
8. The implementation of a District Validation Review Process that includes an on site special education review of each school by the District Validation Review team every four years, including the monitoring of transition services provided to students 14 years and older (Process began in 1997).
9. The development and implementation of a Management Information system (MIS) that includes the capability to track students who are eligible for DIS Transition Services (To be completed by 2003).
10. The development of an interim procedure to track the development of ITPs for students 14 years and older (To be completed by September 2000).

**Item****No. of Students**

**# 4a: Not Receiving Occupation Therapy  
Pursuant to an IEP**

**137**

**Corrective Action**

The District is implementing several activities to ensure the timely provision of occupational therapy (OT) services for eligible students with disabilities. These activities include:

1. Recruitment of Occupational Therapists to fill vacant positions funded by the District to provide OT services to eligible students (71 OT and 11 COTA positions filled since 1998).
2. Placing ads in professional OT journals (very effective).
3. Development of an ongoing relationship with the University of Southern California to take their field work students and hire their graduates.
4. Identification of space by District to provide clinic-based OT.
5. Hiring nonpublic agencies (NPAs) on a per diem basis to provide services to unserved students.

**Item****No. of Students**

**# 4c: Not Receiving Language and Speech Therapy  
Services Pursuant to an IEP**

**1,917**

**Corrective Action**

The District is implementing several activities to ensure the timely provision of language and speech services for eligible students with disabilities. These activities include:

1. Recruitment of Speech Therapists to fill vacant positions funded by the District to provide Language and Speech services to eligible students. These efforts include:
  - a. Utilizing the services of the new Special Education Certificated Employment Operations Section which is charged with recruiting needed special education personnel (Established July 1999)
  - b. Placing ads in *Advance Magazine*.
  - c. Placing ads in the:  
American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA) journal and on their website  
California Speech and Hearing Association (CASHA) journal and on their website
  - d. Sending letters of interest to members of CASHA in surrounding counties.
  - e. Recruiting tams consisting of Personnel and Language and Speech Program Administrators attending national speech conferences.
  - f. Using the District Personnel Recruitment website.
  - g. Contacting retired Speech Therapists to offer full or part-time employment.
  - h. Contacting all NPAs in the state to offer service contracts.

- i. Surveying District Language and Speech providers to determine their interest in working after school and on weekends.
2. Hiring additional nonpublic agencies (NPAs) on a per diem basis to provide services to unserved students.
3. Regular meetings of special task force of senior staff from the Divisions of Special Education and Personnel to address the critical speech personnel shortage.
4. Advising in writing parents of students who are not receiving speech services pursuant to their IEPs and discussing service options.
5. Using private payment to providers with reimbursement through the District, where available.

**Item**

**No. of Students**

**# 5: Not Receiving Services Pursuant to an IEP  
While Under a Long Term Suspension  
(More than 10 Days)**

**36**

**Corrective Action**

The District is implementing several activities to ensure overall compliance including the provision of special education services to students with disabilities who are suspended and the requirement to hold an IEP if the suspension exceeds 10 days. These activities include:

1. The publication and dissemination of *the Special Education Compliance Guide* that contains the District's policies and procedures for achieving compliance with special education laws and regulations. It includes the District's policies and procedures regarding the suspension of students with disabilities (Distributed to site principals and school site training teams from March through June 2000).
2. A District-wide professional development program on the Special Education Compliance Guide that includes training of every principal and school site training team from school to train its staff about the District's policies and procedures for the suspension of students with disabilities (Began March 2000 and completed June 2000).
3. The addition of an Assistant Principal, Elementary Instructional Specialist (AP, EIS) at every District elementary school to ensure special education compliance, including suspension policies and procedures for students with disabilities. (Process began in February 2000 with the placement of 59 AP, EISs). This activity also includes regular ongoing professional development to support the position.
4. The provision of special education professional development for all secondary Assistant Principals to support the achievement of special education compliance standards, including adherence to policies and procedures regarding the suspension of students with disabilities (Scheduled for July and August 2000).
5. The establishment of the Special Education Compliance Department (August, 1998) to train staff and measure and monitor special education compliance, including adherence to policies and procedures regarding the suspension of students with disabilities, throughout the District (18 Compliance Specialists are employed to date, with a total of 32 to be in place by July 2000).
6. The implementation of a District Validation Review Process that includes an on site special education review of each school by the District Validation Review team every four years, including a review of the records of students who have been suspended (The process began in 1997).
7. The development and implementation of a Management Information system (MIS) that includes the capability to track students with disabilities who are being suspended (To be completed by 2003).

**Item****No. of Students**

**# 7: Not Receiving Services In the Least Restrictive Environment  
with Needed Supplementary Aids and Services** **84**

**Corrective Action**

The District is implementing several activities to ensure timely provision of needed supplementary aids and services to students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment pursuant to an IEP. These activities include:

1. Redesigning District assistive technology (AT) databases to reflect equipment status by student (To begin July 2000 and completed by December 2000)
2. Ordering equipment in bulk so that it is in stock as it is needed.
3. Redeploying Assistive Technology (AT) personnel so that specific staff are assigned to deliver and set up equipment and provide training to students. The balance of staff will assess students and participate in the development of their IEPs (Completed June 2000)
4. Recruiting addition AT personnel (In progress).
5. Providing AT training for staff (In progress).

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs****Three year (3) Reevaluation**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Minimally Noncompliant-Highly improved in providing students  
reevaluations**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluations within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluations within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Los Angeles USD	81, 966	81, 832	134	0.2%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant but highly improved in providing students timely annual  
IEPs**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Los Angeles USD	81, 966	79, 949	2, 017	2.5%



## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 10/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	1993 all NC resolved, 1998 30 NC Resolved, 1999-9 NC Resolved		1998 9 NC CDE Follow up Monitor	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 – 49 NC resolved	6/30/00	None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 116 NC Resolved, 24 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE review LEA data submitted to CDE for 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 2. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 3. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b> <b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continue training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance.	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b>	3.0 4.0 5.0 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C;	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00

	5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8 5.9	Part III and IV Forms; Part V Procedural Right and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. B. Provide evidence of implementing districtwide special education database, which informs site administrators of timelines for reassessments; and C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches. 6/30/00		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b>	8.1 8.4 8.7	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the Chanda Smith Consent Decree and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Implementation of Compliance Guide, Part 3- Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C, Part III Forms and, Part IV Instruction/Services/LRE, Forms IV—25 Master Plan for English Language Learners; B. Provide training agenda and Districtwide training schedule; C. Continue LAUSD School Psychologist Intern Program with emphasis on Spanish speaking recruitment D. Provide training on new Compliance Guide and processes completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches; and E. Provide evidence of School Psychologist Intern Program by September 2000.	CDE review of required evidence  CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct vision and hearing screening)	7.0	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Provide evidence of implementation of Memo Z-62 dated 1/99 requiring vision and hearing screening for all students by submitting 10 student records to CDE documenting vision and hearing; B. Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and IV Forms; Part V Procedural Right and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule D. Provide 10 student records by June 30, 2000 E. Provide training on new Compliance Guide and process completed June 30, 2000 with follow up conducted by site level coaches.	CDE review of required evidence which may include a survey of parents	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (IEP conducted within 50 days of written parent consent)	9.0	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically,	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information related to enabling the child to be involved in an progress in the general curriculum; ensuring that IQ tests are not administered to African American students;	10.0 10.2	<p>A. Implementation of compliance Guide-Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and IV Forms; Part V Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights.</p> <p>B. Provide evidence of implementing districtwide special education database, which informs site administrators of timelines for reassessments; and</p> <p>C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches. 6/30/00</p> <p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Same as above</p>	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include all required evaluation information in written reports including providing a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of eligibility determination to the parent)	12.0 12.1 12.2 12.3 12.4 12.5 12.6 12.11 13.0	<p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b></p> <p>A. Evidence of a new School Psychologist report shell and report procedures and storage 9/30/00</p> <p>B. Three year reevaluations that contain all required components required in IDEA '97 and are made available during CDE onsite verification review.</p>	CDE review of required evidence  CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (Conduct 3 year reevaluation with all required components)	15.0 15.2 16.1 16.2	<p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically,</p> <p>A. Implementation of compliance Guide-Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and IV Forms; Part V Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights.</p> <p>B. Provide evidence of implementing districtwide special education database, which informs site administrators of timelines for reassessments; and</p> <p>C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.</p>	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00

<b>IEP</b> (Include all required information and participants)	20.1	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Implementation of compliance Guide-Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and IV Forms; Part IV Instruction/Services/LRE, Sections IV A-J and, Part V-Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. B. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.	CDE review of required evidence  CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
	20.2			
	20.3			
	20.5			
	20.6			
	20.7			
	20.8			
	20.9			
	20.10			
	20.11			
	20.12			
	21.2			
<b>IEP</b> (Conduct Annual Review with all required information)	24.0	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Implementation of compliance Guide-Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and IV Forms; Part V Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. B. Provide evidence of implementing districtwide special education database, which informs site administrators of timelines for reassessments; and C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.	CDE review of required evidence  CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
	24.1			
<b>IEP</b> (Include all required participants including general education teacher)	29.2	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Implementation of Compliance Guide Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part IV-Instruction/Services/LRE, Section IV A-J and Part V: Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. B. Provide training on new Compliance Guide and processes completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.	CDE review of required evidence  CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
	29.3			
	29.4			
	29.8			
<b>IEP</b> (Include a description of the activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education)	33.1	<b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically,	CDE review of	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
	33.2			

program indicating the nature of each activity and the time spent on the activity each day or week)		<p>A. Implementation of Compliance Guide Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part IV- Instruction/Services/LRE , Section IV A-J and Part V: Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights.</p> <p>B. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.</p>	<p>required evidence</p> <p>CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001</p>	
IEP (Transition Requirements)	34.0 35.0 35.6	<p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b></p> <p>A. In collaboration with the LAUSD Special Education Compliance and Transition or School-to-Career Units and the California Department of Education, developed a transition to post-school living professional development plan for administrators and educators which will include both compliance requirements and implementation options</p> <p>B. Schedule a developmental meeting by June 30, 2000 to establish content, trainers, timelines and resources necessary to conduct the professional development series during the 2000/2001 school year for the appropriate secondary personnel.</p> <p>C. Submit the professional development plan to CDE no later than <b>December 2000</b>.</p>	<p>CDE review of required evidence</p> <p>CDE technical assistance 2000-2001</p>	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
IEP (Consider language needs of the student for students with limited English proficiency)	42.0	<p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b></p> <p>Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the Chanda Smith Consent Decree and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically,</p> <p>A. Implementation of Compliance Guide, Part 3- Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C, Part III Forms and, Part IV Instruction/Services/LRE, Forms IV—25 Master Plan for English Language Learners;</p> <p>B. Provide training agenda and Districtwide training schedule;</p> <p>C. Continue LAUSD School Psychologist Intern Program with emphasis on Spanish speaking recruitment</p> <p>D. Provide training on new Compliance Guide and processes completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches; and</p> <p>E. Provide evidence of School Psychologist Intern Program by <b>September 2000</b>.</p>	<p>CDE review of required evidence</p> <p>CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001</p>	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
IEP (Include all requirements for students identified with specific learning disabilities)	45.1 45.2 45.5 45.6	<p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b></p> <p>Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically,</p> <p>A. Implementation of compliance Guide-Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and</p>	<p>CDE review of required evidence</p>	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00

<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Include all required components)	77.0 78.1 78.2 78.3 78.4 78.5 78.6 78.7	IV Forms; Part V Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. B. Provide evidence of implementing districtwide special education database, which informs site administrators of timelines for reassessments; and C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.  <b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> Continued training and implementation of the <i>Special Education Compliance Guide</i> which contains the process, procedures and protocols to bring the district in compliance with the <i>Chanda Smith Consent Decree</i> and state findings of noncompliance. Specifically, A. Implementation of compliance Guide-Part 3 Assessment and Reassessment, Section A-C; Part III and IV Forms; Part V Procedural Rights and Safeguards, Section V-A Parents Rights. B. Provide evidence of implementing districtwide special education database, which informs site administrators of timelines for reassessments; and C. Provide training agenda and districtwide training schedule to CDE completed <b>June 30, 2000</b> with follow up conducted by site level coaches.	CDE review of required evidence  CDE onsite verification review 2000/2001	Noncompliant 4/6-7/00
<b>Verification Review-</b>  <b>Annual IEPs</b>  <b>Reevaluation</b>  <b>Other services (Behavior Intervention Plans)</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  LAUSD has made considerable progress in moving toward compliance status regarding annual reviews and three year reevaluations. Noncompliance remains but to a much lesser degree than previously identified by CDE and district self-report. Corrective actions apply: See Correction Actions Required above (Items 15 & 24) & and CASEMIS requirements  Based on CDE analysis of compliance complaints and district self-report of students not receiving services (as of June 12, 2000) the following corrective actions are required.  For those students enrolled in Nonpublic Schools and have been identified as part of a state compliance complaint investigation found noncompliant:  <b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 1. Reviewed IEPS and revised (if necessary) all IEPs to establish the need for either a behavior intervention plan (BIP) or a behavior support plans as appropriate. The BIP must be developed within the guidelines of 5CCR 3052 and	See CDE actions CASEMIS  CDE continues to investigate each allegation of noncompliance as required in SEA compliance complaint procedures.	Noncompliant 12/1/99  Noncompliant 12/1/99  Noncompliant 1999-2000 Compliance Complaints (Emerging trend)

<p><b>Related Services</b></p> <p><b>Occupational therapy</b></p> <p><b>Speech Language and Hearing</b></p> <p><b>Supplemental aids and services</b></p> <p><b>Services to Students Suspended 10 Days or More</b></p>	<p>be the result of a functional analysis assessment as determined by the IEP team members.</p> <p>2. Provide CDE an updated status of IEPs of students enrolled in NPS and status of behavior intervention plans or behavior support plans. Information needs to include: NPS name, address, location, Administrative Contact name and phone number, student name, parent name and phone number and status of behavioral support according to the IEP. <b>Submit to CDE by 11/1/00</b></p> <p><b>RELATED SERVICES, SUPPLEMENTAL AIDS AND SERVICES &amp; SERVICES FOR STUDENTS SUSPENDED 10 DAYS OR MORE:</b></p> <p>While CDE acknowledges LAUSD's efforts to remedy noncompliance for services required to be implemented for students with disabilities and integrity in self-reporting noncompliance, LAUSD must take bold efforts to correct these longstanding areas that directly affect students and long-lasting positive student outcomes. LAUSD has demonstrated tremendous progress in other systemic areas of noncompliance such as 3 year reevaluations. Student services must be addressed with the same commitment, vigor, and immediacy.</p> <p>LAUSD may partially correct noncompliance similar to CDE compliance complaint procedures. Whenever a failure to implement the IEP occurs, corrective action often provides for compensatory services or reimbursement (if appropriate). The compensatory measures will reflect and constitute an equitable remedy based upon the needs of the student with a disability.</p> <p>For students not receiving occupational therapy, speech and language services, supplementary aids and services, and services not provided for students suspended 10 days or more:</p> <p><b>Los Angeles USD must provide evidence that it has:</b></p> <p>1. Significantly reduced or eliminated any waiting lists for students not receiving the related services, supplemental aids and services and services for students not receiving services when suspended 10 days or more.</p> <p>2. LAUSD must immediately remedy these areas of noncompliance. LAUSD must provide monthly reports to CDE demonstrating reduction and elimination of waiting list for students not receiving the services stated on their IEPs.</p> <p>3. Conducted IEPs (as appropriate) and provided services to students including compensatory services or reimbursement (as appropriate).</p> <p>4. LAUSD will provide an updated status of the number of students not receiving these services, the actions taken by the</p>	<p>CDE review of required evidence which may include parent surveys.</p> <p>CDE review of required evidence.</p> <p>As of January 1, 2001, CDE will move to enforcement procedures, including sanctions if noncompliance remains systemic regarding the provision of related services, supplementary aids and services and the provision of FAPE to students suspended 10 days or more.</p>	<p>Noncompliant 6/12/00</p>
---	---	---	---------------------------------

		district for these students to provide services including compensatory services or reimbursement (as appropriate) determined by the IEP team; student name, parent name and phone number (similar to district submission to CDE on June 12, 2000) on a monthly basis beginning <b>October 1, 2000 through January 1, 2001.</b>		
<b>Physical Therapy</b>		None required	None required	Compliant 6/12/00
<b>Counseling</b>		None required	None required	Compliant 6/12/00
<b>Transition Services</b>		<b>Noncompliant: See Corrective Action Items 34-36.</b>	See CDE activities Items 34-36	Noncompliant 4/5-6/00

**CDE Monitor: Diana Blackmon, Consultant Telephone: 916/323-2616 email: [dblackmon@cde.ca.gov](mailto:dblackmon@cde.ca.gov)  
FAX:916/327-8878 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**



<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>QAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	11/99	Compliant	None	11/99
<b>CCR:</b>	1991	Compliant	None-3 NC Resolved	1991
<b>CCR:</b>	1994	Compliant	None-21 NC Resolved	1994
<b>CCR</b>	1998	Noncompliant	8 NC Resolved 23 NC Currently addressed in Compliance Agreement-Revision due	2000 6/30/00
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	45 NC Resolved, 7 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	5 Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on April 5-6, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

***San Francisco Unified School District***  
**Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

**Item Findings**

**Date(s)** 4/5-6/00

**From a review of student records:**

- 3.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently attempt to modify the general education program prior to referral for special education services.
- 4.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide parents with a written notice that their child is being considered for special education.
- 5.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral.
- 5.3 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide describe personnel by title and evaluation area on the assessment/evaluation plan.
- 5.4 Evaluation plan findings are consistent with the SFUSD self review and CDE Corrective Action Plan. There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently identify the pupil's primary language or language proficiency status on the assessment plan.
- 5.5 SFUSD does not state that tests and other evaluation materials will be provided and administered in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication, and if not, the reasons why it is clearly not feasible to do so.
- 5.6 SFUSD does not consistently state on the evaluation plan that recently evaluations will be considered, including any available independent evaluations.
- 5.7 SFUSD does not consistently state on the evaluation plan that information from the parent request will be considered.
- 5.8 SFUSD does not consistently state on the evaluation plan that alternative means will be used, as appropriate.
- 5.9 SFUSD does not consistently state on the evaluation plan written parent consent and the date on the evaluation plan.
- 7.0 There is evidence that SFUSD students with disabilities do not have a hearing and vision screening when evaluated for initial or three year reevaluation, unless parental permission is denied.

- 8.4 There is evidence that assessments and evaluations are not consistently performed in all areas related to the suspected disability by a multidisciplinary team.
- 8.5 There is evidence that assessments and evaluations do not consistently use a variety of tools and strategies to gather information.
- 9.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent (the signed evaluation plan).
- 10.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.
- 12.2 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently include a statement regarding the validity of the evaluation.
- 12.3 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently state whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.
- 12.8 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently include, in the written report of the evaluation, the determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 13.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide parents with a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination.
- 15.0 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous IEP triennial)
- 15.2 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently provide three year reevaluations that include whether or not the child continues to need special education or any additions or modifications to special education and related services that are needed to enable the child to meet measurable annual goals.
- 20.1 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently include in the IEP a statement of the child's present levels of performance, including how the disability effects the child's involvement and progress
- 20.3 There is evidence that SFUSD's IEPs do not consistently demonstrate the direct relationship between present levels of performance, any evaluations and the educational services to be provided and the student's goals....
- 20.6 There is evidence that SFUSD is inconsistent when developing IEPs and does not always explain the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with

nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.

- 20. 7 There is no evidence that the SFUSD IEP process includes a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 20.12 There is no evidence that the SFUSD IEPs, beginning at least one year before the student reaches 18 years, inform the student of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turning 18.
- 24 From a review of student records and CASEMIS data there is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently convene IEP team meetings periodically, but, not less than annually, to review the student's IEP.
- 24.1 There is evidence that SFUSD IEP teams do not consistently review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (short term objectives).
- 24.2 There is evidence that SFUSD IEP teams do not consistently revise the IEP as appropriate.
- 29.8 There is no evidence that the SFUSD invites the child, when appropriate or when the IEP meeting will be considering postsecondary transition, to the IEP team meeting.
- 45.7 There is no evidence that SFUSD staff/ IEP teams consistently make the determination that the disability is a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes and is not a result of environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.
- 77 There is evidence that SFUSD does not consistently notify parents in writing a reasonable time before the district proposes to initiate or change the educational placement of a child (an IEP team meeting).
- 78.1 The notice does not include a statement about the purpose of the meeting, the description of the action proposed or refused.
- 78.6 The notice does not include a statement that the parents of a child with a disability have protections under the procedural safeguards of the law, and know the means by which a copy of a document may be obtained.

- 94.0 There is evidence that the SFUSD preschool child's IEP includes information about the duration of group services: not to exceed four hours unless determined otherwise in the child's IEP.
- 123.5 There is no evidence that the district's IFSPs have a statement of the natural environments in which services will be delivered; a justification of the extent to which, if any, individual services will be provided in a natural environment; the projected date for the initiation of services and the anticipated duration of services.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance**

#### **History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)** 4/5-6/00

All items found noncompliant in the verification review were previously identified in the current CDE Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for San Francisco USD of 10/1999 and continue to be addressed in this CAP.

#### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)** 4/12-19/00

### **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of service logs
- On site student/staff observations
- In person interviews with parents, teachers and service providers
- In person interviews with most students
- In person interview with administrators

### **FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS**

No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation for selected students. All IEPs were implemented as written.

**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

Compliance Area for Students:	Number of Students	District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance
Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)	1380	<p>See SFUSD/CDE Corrective Action Plan</p> <p>SFUSD sent CDE via electronic databases, student names, parent names and phone numbers of students with overdue IEPs, students with overdue re-evaluations and students who may need transition services (ages 14 and 16). Hardcopy of the same electronic data was also sent to CDE.</p> <p>When reviewing SFUSD's database in June of any year several factors must be considered. The total student count on the database is inflated due to a lack of time to correct the following factors:</p> <p>Elimination of students who have graduated or received a certificate of completion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students over 22 years of age;</li> <li>▪ Students withdrawn from the district;</li> <li>▪ Former Pre-K students who have not enrolled in the district for Kindergarten;</li> <li>▪ Students who have been demitted from special education.</li> <li>▪ Thus the data over-identifies noncompliance</li> </ul> <p>We have been working on a data base for the past year and anticipate further improvements by December 2000. At this point in time, the following explanations related to student level data requested is offered.</p> <p><b>IEPs Past Due (1380):</b> This number includes a substantial percentage (approximately 25%) of students who are no longer receiving services or no longer in the district, but who are still on the database. A major focus next year will be to clean-up the data base by December 2000.</p>
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	524	<p>See SFUSD/CDE Corrective Action Plan</p> <p><b>Reevaluations Over Due (524)</b> See above comments</p>
Not receiving needed transition services	67	<p>See SFUSD/CDE Corrective Action Plan</p> <p>CDE asked for information about the number of students <i>not receiving</i> needed transition services. We are only able to report that out of the 1,075 students, 14 and 16 years of age, 67 (6%) may not have needed transition services <i>written on their IEP</i>.</p>
<p>Not receiving needed related services</p> <p>Occupational therapy</p> <p>Physical therapy</p> <p>Speech and language therapy</p> <p>Counseling</p> <p>Other(s)</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p><b>Not Receiving Related Services:</b> Though not on any database, the Program Director of DIS services reports there is no waiting list for DIS/related services provided by the district. Mental Health has verbally reported that there are no students waiting for mental health services however they have not provided us with any data upon which this can be based.</p>

	0	
	*	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	-	DATA NOT AVAILABLE Not Receiving Services During Suspension/Expulsion. This data is not available. CDE has never before indicated that this information was to be collected. Pursuant to Part 34, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 300.146, we understand that CDE will be required to collect data on the rates within and among districts on suspension/expulsion rates, and again, next year we will be working on our data base to include such information.
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	-	DATA NOT AVAILABLE See above
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	-	DATA NOT AVAILABLE Though not on any database, no students in the SFUSD are on a waiting list for inclusion into the regular classroom or for any other placement in a lesser restrictive environment. Nor, as noted above, are any students on a waiting list for DIS/related services. It is unclear whether CDE is asking for information on waiting lists for LRE or waiting lists for supplementary aids and services. At any rate, the district has never been asked for such data, ...reliable data is simply not available.  Please understand that SFUSD received CDE's request May 12, 2000. With school closing, there was simply neither time nor staff to manually compile information on the items which are not in the database. While we would like to support CDE, it is important that we be given notice, at a year in advance, of data that must be collected.

### **CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

#### **Three year (3) Reevaluation**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)

December, 1999 Pupil Count

#### **Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluations within timelines	# Students not receiving Reevaluations within timelines	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
		<b>COMPLIANT</b>	<b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	
San Francisco USD	6, 865	5, 988	877	12.8%

#### **Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)

December, 1999 Pupil Count

#### **Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
		<b>COMPLIANT</b>	<b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	
San Francisco USD	6, 865	5, 156	1, 709	24.9%

# Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

## SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 11/99
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1991, 1994 all NC Resolved <b>1998 CDE Compliance Agreement</b> 8 NC Resolved 23 NC Remain 6/30/00		CDE Compliance Agreement-CDE Monitor, ongoing Agreement Revision due to CDE 6/30/00	Compliant 1991, 1994 Noncompliant 1998 to 6/30/00
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	<b>Not due</b>		None required	None required
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 45 NC Resolved, 7 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students		1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students		Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
Noncompliant 4/5-6/00	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>  All noncompliant findings for items identified in the Verification Review process conducted April 4-5, 2000, were addressed in the San Francisco USD Voluntary Corrective Action Plan/CDE Corrective Action Plan (CAP) agreed upon 10/99. All areas of noncompliance continue to be addressed by the revised CDE Corrective Action Plan for San Francisco USD dated July 1, 2000.	See left for CDE ongoing activities and dates	Noncompliant 6/30/00



		<p>The revised CAP continues to include all identified items of systemic noncompliance as identified per data collection and analysis from compliance complaint investigations, CCR self-review findings, verification review findings L(4/2000) and CASEMIS.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance for each items includes as appropriate, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policies and procedures development;</li> <li>▪ Site training and personnel development activities;</li> <li>▪ Implementation of compliant requirements at the student level including IEP implementation;</li> </ul> <p><b>CDE Activities and Dates: All activities are ongoing and will continue for the 2000-2001 year.</b></p> <p>Noncompliant items previously verified as completed (and compliant) per the CAP will continue to be monitored throughout the 2000-2001 year to ensure continued compliance.</p> <p>Monitoring and technical assistance for each item is primarily provided by a CDE assigned monitor. Continuous activities include but are limited to:</p> <p>On site reviews Review of policies and procedures Ongoing interviews with staff, parents, students and advocacy groups Classroom student/teacher observations Telephone and written surveys with parents</p> <p>In addition, San Francisco USD provides CDE quarterly progress reports on all identified noncompliant areas which are further validated by the CDE monitor utilizing the above methods, or any other necessary method, to ensure compliance and the maintenance of compliance.</p> <p>In addition to the CDE monitor, CDE Focused Monitoring Technical Assistance consultants provide continuous technical assistance as part of the Focused Monitoring Quality Assurance Process relating to Key Performance Indicators and the improvement of student outcomes (SFUSD-voluntary Collaborative District, 1999-2000). These activities are coordinated within CDE to communicate and collaborate with SFUSD in both areas of compliance and positive student outcomes.</p>		
<b>Verification Review-Annual IEPs</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b> See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Reevaluation</b>		See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements		Noncompliant 12/1/99

Related Services OT PT SLH Counseling Other		For areas of services where SFUSD did not submit student level data regarding services due to the district's current state of data base development, CDE will continue monitoring of services to students with disabilities as stated in the existing CAP as well as provide ongoing technical assistance in data collection. By 9/30/00 SFUSD expects to have a complete review and revision of its data collection system which will ensure that students receive services pursuant to their IEPs.	CDE Monitor ongoing follow up and technical assistance to ensure FAPE to students.	Compliant 4/5-6/00 Same as above Same as above Same as above Noncompliant 4/5-6/00
Supplementary Aids & Services		-0-Noncompliance Identified. See above CDE activities.	None required	Compliant 4/5-6/00
Students-long term suspension Expulsions		-0-Noncompliance Identified See above CDE activities. -0-Noncompliance Identified See above CDE activities. -0-Noncompliance Identified See above CDE activities. -0-Noncompliance Identified See above CDE activities.	None required	Same as above
Transition		Procedural noncompliance identified by verification review findings. Corrective Actions addressed in the Revised CDE – SFUSD CAP of July 1, 2000  -0-Noncompliance Identified  -0-Noncompliance Identified	See CDE-SFUSD Revised CAP 7/1/2000	

**CDE Monitor: Christine Pittman, Consultant Telephone:916/327-4218 email: [cpittman@cde.ca.gov](mailto:cpittman@cde.ca.gov)**

**FAX: 916/327-3706 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

**and**

**CDE Focused Monitoring Technical Assistance Consultant,: Ellen Broms, Consultant**

**Telephone:916/327-3654 email: [ebroms@cde.ca.gov](mailto:ebroms@cde.ca.gov) FAX: 916/327-3706 Address: CDE-SED, 515**

**L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>SADDLEBACK VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>QAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-5 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Compliant	None-0 NC Identified	1996
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Compliant	None-0 NC Reported	1999
<b>(Self Review)</b>				
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	3 NC Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on May 25-26, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/25-26/00
2.0	IEP meetings are not consistently held within 50 days of parent consent for evaluation.	
89.0	For preschool children with disabilities, the IEP team does not consistently include a regular preschool teacher, if the child is, or may be participating in a regular education environment.	

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/25-26/00
	Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are two reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified.  Timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99 and district submission of data June 15, 2000. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.	

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 6/12-16/00
Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at areas of related services (OT, PT, Counseling, SLH),	

supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of service logs
- Review of staff time sheets
- Student/staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents
- In person interview with administrators, teachers and service providers including NPS teacher and director

No noncompliances were discovered as a result of reviews targeted toward IEP implementation.

**Saddleback Valley Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)	0	
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	0	
Not receiving needed transition services	0	
Not receiving needed related services	0	
Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluations within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluations within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Saddleback Valley USD	3, 087	2, 915	172	5.6%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Saddleback Valley USD	3, 087	2, 915	172	5.6%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### SADDLEBACK VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>		<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1992 an NC Resolved, 1996 –0- NC Identified		None required	Compliant 1992, 1996
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –0-NC		None required	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 3 NC Resolved		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	6/15/00	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	Annual Reviews Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (Conduct IEP</b>	9.0	<b>Saddleback Valley USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within fifty days of obtaining written parental consent to an evaluation; 9/30/00	CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00	Noncompliant 5/24-25/00

<p>within 50 days of written consent</p> <p><b>IEP Preschool</b> (IEP team to include at least one regular preschool teacher, if the child is, or may be participating in a regular education environment)</p>	89	<p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the timelines for completing IEPs;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Saddleback Valley USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to developing and implementing the IEP for children who are transitioning from early intervention services under Part C.</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding developing and implementing the IEP for children who are transitioning from early intervention services under Part C.</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who transitioned from early intervention services under Part C to preschool services under Part B, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 5/24-25/00</p>
<p><b>Verification Review</b></p> <p><b>Annual IEPs</b></p> <p><b>Reevaluation</b></p> <p><b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other</p> <p><b>Transition</b></p> <p><b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b></p> <p><b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b></p>		<p><b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b></p> <p>See Correction Actions Required -CASEMIS requirements</p> <p>See Corrective Actions Required-CASEMIS requirements</p> <p>-0-Noncompliance Identified</p> <p>-0-Noncompliance Identified</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance Identified</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance Identified</p>	<p>See CDE Activities Reevaluation &amp; Annual Review CASEMIS</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>Noncompliant 12/1/99 Noncompliant 12/1/99</p> <p>Compliant 5/23-6/19/00</p> <p>Compliant 5/23-6/19/00 Compliant 5/23-6/19/00 Compliant 5/23-6/19/00</p>

**CDE Monitor: Muffin Kent, Consultant Telephone:916/445-4544email: [mkent@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mkent@cde.ca.gov)  
FAX: 917/327-5233 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**



**Summary Review of Selected Districts: Section B**  
**FedCAP Agencies**  
**Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students with Disabilities**  
**Annual IEP Reviews and Three Year Reevaluations**  
**District Self-Reports: Students Not Receiving Services**

<b>District</b>	<b>Annual IEP Reviews CDE Final Report to OSEP 2/28/99</b>	<b>Annual IEP Reviews CASEMIS 12/1/99</b>	<b>District Self Report 6/12/00</b>		<b>3 Year Reevaluations CDE Final Report to OSEP 2/28/99</b>	<b>3 Year Reevaluations CASEMIS 12/1/99</b>	<b>District Self Report 6/12/00</b>	
<b>Fairfield Suisun USD</b>	22	80	14		16	51	10	
<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b>	FedCAP LEA as of 1998	644	384		FedCAP LEA as of 1998	416	121	
<b>Holtville USD</b>	2	39	0		1	9	0	
<b>Los Angeles USD</b>	8589	2017	1985		1014	134	123	
<b>San Francisco USD</b>	1716	1709	1380		214	877	524	
<b>Saddleback Valley USD</b>	0	172	0		0	172	0	

## Summary Review of Selected Districts: Section B

### FedCAP Agencies

Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students with Disabilities: Related Services

#### *District Self-Reports: Students Not Receiving Services*

District	OT	PT	SLH	Counseling	Transition Services	Suspension 10 days +	Expulsion	Supplementary Aids & Services
<b>Fairfield Suisun USD</b>	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	105 staff trained	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP
	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 NC Identified	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students
<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b>	Not collected for 1998 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP
	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students
<b>Holtville USD</b>	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	Plus all middle & high school staff trained	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP
	6/12/00	6/12/00	6/12/00	6/12/00	6/12/00 0 NC Identified	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students
<b>Los Angeles USD</b>	2/28/99 350	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 160	2/28/99 Data not compiled for CDE	2/28/99 2092 staff trained	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP
	6/12/00 37	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 1917	6/12/00 0 Students	CDE Identified Systemic NC Verification Review 4/5-6/00	6/12/00 36	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 84
<b>San Francisco USD</b>	2/28/99 27 Students OT	2/28/99 14 Students	2/28/99 150 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 599 staff trained	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP
	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 67 Students	6/12/00 Data Not available	6/12/00 Data not available	6/12/00 Data not available

<b>Saddleback Valley USD</b>	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 0 Students	2/28/99 81 staff trained: All special education staff	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP	Not collected for 1996 CAP
	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00 0 Students	6/12/00	6/12/00	6/12/00	6/12/00 0 Students
<b>C. Noncompliance in Public Agencies with Long-Standing Systemic Noncompliance</b>								

**C.1. CDE will demonstrate that it has ensured that the public agencies with long-standing systemic noncompliance are in compliance in the areas described in OSEP's 1996 and 1999 California Monitoring Reports and can provide data that shows positive impact on services to children with disabilities (like the district-specific data that CDE submitted in response to the 1996 Corrective Action Plan).**

**These areas include:**

- Current Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)
- Transition
- Related Services
- FAPE: Students suspended/expelled
- Least Restrictive Environment; and
- Reevaluations

**C.2. CDE will demonstrate that it has used the Quality Assurance Process, as necessary, to ensure systemic compliance.**

**C.3. CDE will demonstrate that it takes enforcement action to ensure compliance when other actions have not ensured compliance.**

**For each public agency, CDE will provide the following:**

- a. The specific areas of continuing noncompliance, including, for each, specific data regarding the number of children not receiving services to which they are entitled under Part B as reported by the LEA (district) and validated by CDE;
- b. The required corrective actions, including specific activities and timelines;
- c. The current status of those corrective actions and of compliance, including whether children are receiving needed services and any evidence from parents that corrective action has occurred; and
- d. The specific additional actions that CDE has taken or will take, including but not limited to follow-up data collection, technical assistance, and sanctions to secure compliance/correction, and the date on which CDE took or by which CDE will take each such action.

For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides information for the following districts:

- Santa Barbara Elementary School District
- Oakland Unified School District

**District Compliance Profile**

**SANTA BARBARA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b>QAP Findings</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>	<i><b>Current Status</b></i>	<i><b>Required Corrective Actions</b></i>	<i><b>Date(s)</b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1991	Compliant	None-0-NC Identified	1991
<b>CCR:</b>	1994	Compliant	None-4 NC Resolved	1994
<b>CCR :</b>	1998	Compliant	None-1 NC Resolved	1998
<b>(Self Review)</b>	Not due			
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Compliant	None-1 NC Resolved	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE April 12-14, 2000**

For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;

- LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)**4/12-14/00

-0- Systemic Noncompliant Findings through verification process review

CDE identified two areas of noncompliance evidenced through 12/1/99 CASEMIS data.

15 LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting or previous triennial.

24 The IEP team does not review the progress but, not less than annually, the students IEP.

CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

#### **Item Findings**

**Date(s)**4/12-14/00

A review of previous CDE Coordinated Compliance Validation Reviews (CCR), compliance complaints and due process findings indicate that there are no areas of reoccurring noncompliance.

-0- Systemic Noncompliant Findings through verification process review for reoccurring noncompliance based on prior noncompliance history.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)**4/12-14/00-6/30/00

## **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were selected by CDE for students receiving related services and other special education services. CDE conducted an onsite visit to six of the ten classroom of the children selected for verification of IEP implementation. CDE consultants observed the children in the classrooms and interviewed each child's teacher about services the child was receiving and progress the child was making. For the four children who were not observed, calls were made to the classroom teachers to discuss services provided and children's progress. In all 10 reviews, services being provided were compared with those written into the child's IEP.

Parent questionnaires in both English and Spanish were sent home for parents to fill out in order to determine what services the children were receiving and whether or not parents were satisfied with the program provided. Parents returned these surveys directly to the CDE Consultant in Sacramento.

## **FINDINGS**

Results of interviews, observations, and surveys indicate the IEPs are being implemented as written.

## **CONCLUSION**

-0- Systemic noncompliant findings through verification process review-IEP implementation.

### **Santa Barbara Elementary School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	0	CASEMIS 12/1/99 CDE data indicated noncompliance caused by data input errors at local level. Submitted data to CDE on June 15, 2000 demonstrates correction of CASEMIS data. June 30, 2000 end of year report will reflect corrections. Student level data correction on annual IEPs submitted to CDE 6/15/00
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	0	CASEMIS 12/1/99 CDE data indicated noncompliance caused by data input errors at local level. Submitted data to CDE on June 15, 2000 demonstrates correction of CASEMIS data. June 30, 2000 end of year report will reflect corrections. Student level data correction on 3 year reevaluations submitted to CDE 6/15/00

Not receiving needed transition services	0	NA
Not receiving needed related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	NA
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	NA
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	NA
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	NA

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Santa Barbara Elementary SD	859	702	157	18.3%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Santa Barbara Elementary SD	859	461	398	46.3%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### SANTA BARBARA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>	<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required	None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1991 –0- NC Identified, 1994-4 NC Resolved 1998 –1 NC Resolved	None required	Compliant 1991, 1994, 1998
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	Not due	None required	None required
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 1 NC Resolved	Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Compliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>CASEMIS</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> 6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant



<b>Data Annual Reviews</b>	Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students			12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>		
		<b>-0- Systemic Noncompliance Identified</b> Four Individual Student Level Noncompliant Findings and Required Corrective Actions Only	None required	Compliant 4/12-14/00
<b>IEP Interim Placement</b> (IEP team to meet before 30 days & make final recommendations after review of information, records, reports and evaluations from previous records)	26	<b>Student:</b> M.P (Roosevelt School) <b>Finding:</b> Did not have assessment information to justify placement after interim placement  Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that all district psychologists have been trained in the requirements for interim 30 day placements (EC 56325 (b) and that ensures that assessment information documenting special education eligibility will be monitored for compliance for placements after 30 days. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher)	29.2	<b>Student:</b> N.A. (Cleveland School) <b>Finding:</b> No general education teacher at the IEP meeting. <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that the special education staff (teachers) at Cleveland School have been inserviced on the requirement of having a general education teacher at a pupil's IEP. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Provide written notice of action proposed or refused)	78	<b>Student:</b> N.A. (Cleveland School) <b>Finding:</b> No IEP team notice in record indicating parent was invited. <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will ensure that the special education staff at Cleveland School have been directed to place all IEP team meeting notices in a pupil's record. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include a statement that tests and other evaluation materials will be provided in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication)	5.5	<b>Student:</b> D.R. (Monroe School) <b>Finding:</b> Primary language reported as Spanish. Nothing reported by psychologist that tests conducted in Spanish. Speech therapist states tested in English only. <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that district psychologists have been trained to write their reports to include statements that address a pupil's primary language and a plan that ensures that psychologists reports will be reviewed for compliance according to EC56320(b)(1) and 5 CCR 3022. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b>	8.1	<b>Student:</b> D.R (Monroe School) <b>Finding:</b> Not tested in Spanish.	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00

(Evaluations are administered in the child's native language or other mode of communication)				
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (validity)	12.2	<b>Corrective Action:</b> Same as above  <b>Student:</b> D.R. (Monroe School) <b>Finding:</b> No statement of validity of evaluation in file <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that evaluation reports contain statements regarding the validity of the evaluation. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>IFSP IDEA-Part C</b> (Written notice for the IFSP meeting) is provided to the parent and other members of the multidisciplinary team in a timely manner)	120	<b>Student:</b> C.G <b>Finding:</b> No prior notice to parents of meeting in file <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that staff have received a review of procedural safeguard requirements to be provided to parents.	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>IFSP IDEA-Part C</b> (Parent is provided with a written notice regarding the proposal to initiate the identification, evaluation, and assessment of the child's needs for early intervention services)	104.3	<b>Student:</b> C.G <b>Finding:</b> No prior notice to parents of meeting in file <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that staff have received a review of requirements of written notice to be provided to parents. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>IFSP IDEA-Part C</b> (Evaluations and Assessments are completed within 45 days of the date the district or regional center received the referral)	109	<b>Student:</b> C.G <b>Finding:</b> Assessment deadline overdue by 6 days. <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that staff have received a review of evaluation procedures with all staff to ensure required timelines are met. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>IFSP IDEA-Part C</b> (Document in child's record if evaluations or assessments are not completed within 45 days regarding exceptional circumstances described in law)	110	<b>Student:</b> C.G <b>Finding:</b> No documentation of parent approval for extension or explanation of special circumstances. <b>Corrective Action:</b> Santa Barbara Elementary SD will provide evidence that staff have received a review of evaluation procedures regarding documentation of special circumstances for assessments and evaluations not completed within the 45 day required timeline. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00

<b>IFSP IDEA-Part C Procedural Safeguards (Provide documentation that prior to initial evaluation and assessment to determine eligibility and annually thereafter, service coordinators provided written notice to parents)</b>	154	<b>Student:</b> C.G <b>Finding:</b> No written notice in file.. <b>Corrective Action:</b> The district will provide evidence that staff have received a review of procedural safeguard requirements to be provided to parents. 9/30/00	CDE review of required evidence	Noncompliant 4/12-14/00
<b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs</b>  <b>Reevaluation</b>  <b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other  <b>Transition</b>  <b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>  <b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b>  See Correction Actions Required -CASEMIS requirements  See Corrective Actions Required - CASEMIS requirements  -0- Noncompliance Identified   NA (Elementary District)  -0- Noncompliance Identified  -0- Noncompliance Identified	See CDE Activities Annual Review & Reevaluation CASEMIS  None required  NA  None required  None required	Noncompliant 12/1/99  Noncompliant 12/1/99 Compliant 4/12-14/00 6/30/00  NA  Compliant 4/12-14/00 6/30/00 Compliant 4/12-14/00 6/30/00

**CDE Monitor: Carol Ginzburg Telephone:916/445-4559 email: [cginzbur@cde.ca.gov](mailto:cginzbur@cde.ca.gov)  
FAX: 916/327-8878 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i>QAP Findings</i>	<i>Date(s)</i>	<i>Current Status</i>	<i>Required Corrective Actions</i>	<i>Date(s)</i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-13 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1996	Noncompliant	18 NC Resolved, 3 NC CDE follow up	1996
			CDE Compliance Agreement	12/31/99
		Noncompliant	20 NC Resolved, 2 NC CDE follow up (con't.)	2/7/00
<b>CCR</b> <b>(Self Review)</b>	1999	Noncompliant	2 NC-CDE follow up	6/30/00
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	25 NC Resolved, 2 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on April 20-21, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
- Transition services;

- related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 4/20-21/00
4.0	LEA does not provide parents with a written notice that their child is being considered for special education referral	
7.0	All students who are evaluated for an initial or three year reevaluation do not receive a hearing and vision screening unless parental permission is denied.	
8.4	Evaluations are not performed in all areas of suspected disability by a multidisciplinary team.	
9.0	Signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
12.2	The evaluation does not contain a statement regarding validity of the evaluation	
12.3	The evaluation does not include findings whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.	
12.4	Evaluations do not include whether the student's needs can be met in the regular classroom.	
12.6	Evaluations do not note the relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting.	
12.7	Evaluations fail to discuss relevant health, developmental and medical findings, if any.	

- 12.8 Evaluations lacked a determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 12.11 Student records did not indicate the basis for making the determination of eligibility.
- 13.0 Review of student records could not verify that parents were provided a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility.
- 15.0 Three year reevaluations were not always completed on time.
- 15.2 Student records did not contain additions or modifications so that students could meet annual goals.
- 20.3 Student records did not always contain benchmarks and goals in their IEPs.
- 20.6 Student records indicated a lack of an explanation of the extent, if any, to which a student will participate with general education students.
- 20.7 Student records did not disclose how the student's parents will be regularly informed of their progress towards their annual goals or other such means at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children.
- 20.8 Student records did not always indicate whether the student will take district or statewide achievement tests.
- 20.9 A review of student records did not indicate consistent information regarding the projected date for initiating services and modifications.
- 20.10 Student records lack anticipated frequency, duration and location for services and modifications.
- 24.0 Review of records indicated that the IEP team does not meet at least annually to review students IEPs.
- 24.1 IEPs are not being done at all or not on time.
- 29.2 The IEP team does not include at least one general education teacher of the child (if the child is in or may be participating in general education).
- 33.1 A review of student records indicated the lack of description to integrate the student into the regular education program
- 33.2 Student records lacked a description of activities to support student transition into the regular education program.

- 34.0 Student files did not always contain a transition plan for students beginning at age 14.
- 45.1 For students with an identified learning disability, student records did not verify that the disability was not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.
- 45.6 Records do not indicate any educationally relevant findings.
- 46.0 Documents reviewed do not always indicate the date that the IEP takes effect.
- 77.0 A review of records indicates parents are not provided with written prior notice of proposed action(s).
- 78.3 Student records do not indicate if any options were considered and/or rejected by the district.
- 78.6 No verification in student records that parents are aware of their procedural safeguards.
- 88.5 No verification from student records that the extent of regular education participation was considered (preschool).
- 91.0 Records reviewed lacked evidence of special education preschool students are educated with nondisabled preschool students.
- 94.0 Record review does not indicate duration of group services.
- 95.0 Records do not always indicate the setting for preschool services.
- 109.0 Evaluations and assessments are not always completed in 45 days.
- 123.5 Duration of services and need for services are not always found in student records.

<p><b>CCR District Self-Review Noncompliant Findings (Submitted to CDE July 1, 1999)</b></p>
--

Item	Finding	Status: Noncompliant	Date: 6/30/00
15.0	LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).		

- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP
- 59.5 The LEA does not schedule time set-aside for staff development, including time when school personnel are released from their regular duties.  
**Status: Noncompliant** **Date: 6/30/00**
- 80.7b Procedural Safeguards: Notice does not contain information regarding requesting a due process hearing relating to the identification, assessment, evaluation, education placement or the provision of a free appropriate public education for their child, that must be filed within three years from the date the parent knew or had reason to know of the facts that are the basis for the hearing request.  
**Status: Compliant.** Item cleared 1/1/00. Notice changed to contain all required information. **Date: 6/30/00**

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance**

#### **History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Item Findings** **Date(s) 4/20-21/00**

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. These areas are listed below.

- 15.0. LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP
- 59.5 The LEA does not schedule time set-aside for staff development, including time when school personnel are released from their regular duties.

This item is being addressed through the Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) with CDE continuous monitoring of FCMAT recommendations to correct this area of noncompliance.

In keeping with discussions with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) staff during their April 2000 onsite visit to California, CDE in conjunction with FCMAT, and the CDE District Collaborative



Project (DCP), continues the CDE/SED consultant liaison to Oakland USD for ongoing monitoring of noncompliance correction.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

#### **Findings**

**Date(s)** 5/8/00 & 6/19/00

Ten student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs. These reviews looked at related services, supplementary aids and services (LRE) and suspension/expulsion, (students receiving services/FAPE). The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of service logs and staff time sheets
- Student/staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents
- In person interviews with administrators, students and service providers

Five (5) noncompliant findings were found all dealing with the lack of general education staff at the student's IEP. Findings indicate that services required on IEPs are implemented as written.

The lack of general education teachers at the IEP is noted in the Verification Review student records section with subsequent corrective actions required by CDE.

#### **For IEP implementation: -0- Noncompliant findings**

### **Oakland Unified School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	281	By June 30, 2000 overdue IEPs will be completed Student names, parents names & telephone numbers provided to CDE as required 6/13/00 (given to CDE FMTA regional consultant)
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	110	By June 30, 2000 over due triennials will be completed. Student names, parents names & telephone numbers provided to CDE as required 6/13/00 (given to CDE FMTA regional consultant)
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b>  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language	0	

therapy Counseling Other(s)		
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Non compliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Oakland USD	5, 775	5, 081	694	12.0%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  COMPLIANT	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines NONCOMPLIANT	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Oakland USD	5, 775	44, 644	1, 131	19.6%

**Corrective Action Plan (CAP)**

**OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>	<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required	None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required - 1992, all NC Resolved, 1996 3 NC Not Resolved	1996 3 NC CDE follow up Monitor	Compliant 1992, Noncompliant 1996-6/30/00
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –4 Remaining NC CDE Continued follow up/monitor 6/30/00-See Corrective Action Plan with Items	1999 4 NC CDE follow up Monitor	Noncompliant 1999-6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 25 NC Resolved, 2 Open	Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including	Noncompliant 12/1/99

			sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students	6/15/00	Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b> <b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b>		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (written notice of referral to parents)</b>	4.0	9/30/00 Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports included all required contents; Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (Vision and hearing screening)</b>	7.0	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures. 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child’s family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation (Evaluation in all areas of suspected disability by multidisciplinary team)</b>	8.4	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to using a multidisciplinary team to conduct evaluations in all areas related to suspected disability; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the use of a multidisciplinary team to conduct evaluations in all areas related to the suspected disability.	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Signed evaluation plan resulting in an IEP within 50 days)	9.0	<p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within fifty days of obtaining written parental consent to an evaluation;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the timelines for completing IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information to enable child to be involved in and progress in the general education)	10.0	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to evaluation how the child's disability affects their ability to be involved and progress in the general curriculum;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (validity)	12.2	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Statement of test validity for intended purposes)	12.3	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parents surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Statement regarding regular education modifications)	12.4	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Evaluation report to include information regarding relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting)	12.6	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include relevant health, developmental and medical	12.7	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state 2. and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00

findings if any)		<p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (determination of effects of environment, cultural, or economic disadvantage )	12.8	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include the basis for the determination of eligibility)	12.11	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports including all required contents;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements, policies and procedures;</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide parents with a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of eligibility determination)	13.0	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility determination;</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding providing parents with a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility</p>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00

		determination; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been, evaluated for initial special education eligibility or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number.	CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	
<b>Evaluation</b> (3 year)	15.0	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Evaluation</b> (Include additions or modifications so that students could meet annual goals)	15.2	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (Demonstrate a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, any evaluations and the education services to be provided and the student's goals and benchmarks)	20.3	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b>				



(Explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extracurricular and nonacademic activities.)	20.6	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to participating with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participating with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/20-21/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Statement of how parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress.)</p>	20.7	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs ;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/20-21/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether their child will take district or statewide achievement tests.)</p>	20.8	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or districtwide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the child's IEP;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or districtwide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the child's IEP;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required</p>	<p>Noncompliant 4/20-21/00</p>

<b>IEP</b> (Provide the projected date for initiating services and modifications)	20.9	eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00  <b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	11/1/00 that may include parent surveys  CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include the anticipated frequency, duration and location of the recommended services and modifications)	20.10	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (The IEP team must meet at least annually to review the student's IEP)	24.00	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the review of the IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b>				

<p>(The IEP team must meet at least annually to review the student's IEP to review progress towards annual goals, benchmarks, and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher in the IEP)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (A description of the activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education program indicating the nature of each activity, and the time spent on the activity each day or week)</p> <p><b>IEP</b> (Description of activities to</p>	24.1	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the review of the IEPs;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
	29.2	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the participation of general education teachers in the IEP;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
	33.1	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
	33.2	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence</b></p>		

integrate the special education student into the regular education program		<p><b>that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related supporting the transition of students from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to general education classrooms in the public school;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have transferred from special classes or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian schools to the general education classroom in the public school, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (Transition requirements)	34.0	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to transition for students age 14, including IEPs that contains goals and benchmarks that focus on the transition needs of the student in his/her course of study such as advanced placement courses or vocational education.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to transition;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (For students with SLD, statement that the disability is not the result of vision, hearing, motor impairment or emotional disturbance)	45.1	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with learning disabilities;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00

<b>IEP</b> (For students with SLD, include any educationally relevant findings)	45.6	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with learning disabilities; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP</b> (The IEP is in effect before special education and related services are provided to a child at the beginning of each year (date))	46.0	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Staff Development</b> (Continuing item from CCR Self Review)	59.5	The LEA does not schedule time set-aside for staff development, including time when school personnel are released from their regular duties. This item is being addressed through the Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) with CDE continuous monitoring of FCMAT recommendations to correct this area of noncompliance.	Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) with CDE continuous monitoring of FCMAT recommendations to correct his area of noncompliance. CDE in conjunction with FCMAT, and the CDE District Collaborate Project (DCP) continues the CDE/SED consultant liaison to Oakland USD for ongoing monitoring	Noncompliant 7/1/99

<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written Notice Requirements)	77.0 78.3 78.6	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to provision of prior written notice to parents; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	of noncompliance correction.  CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP Preschool</b> (Explanation of the extent, if any to which the child will not participate with nondisabled (preschool) children in the regular (preschool) class )	88.5	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to developing and implementing the IEP for children who are transitioning from early intervention services under IDEA, Part C; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to developing and implementing the IEP for children who are transitioning from early intervention services under IDEA, Part C; 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have transitioned from early intervention services under Part C to special education preschool services under Part B, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IEP- Preschool</b> (Duration of group services does not exceed four hours unless determined otherwise in the child's IEP)	94.0	<b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to ensuring that group services for preschool children do not exceed four hours unless stated on the IEP; 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to group services for preschool children do not exceed four hours unless stated on the IEP; 4. Provide CDE with a list of preschool students, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00  CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00

<b>IEP- Preschool</b> (IEPs indicate preschool settings)	95	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to settings for preschool children are indicated on the IEP;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to settings for preschool children are indicated on the IEP;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of preschool students, along with contact information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IFSP-IDEA Part C</b> (All evaluations and assessments are completed within 45 days of the date that the district or regional center received the referral)	109.0	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and assessment of infants and toddlers with disabilities;</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to evaluation and assessment of infants and toddlers with disabilities ;</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students, birth to three years of age, who have had an IFSP developed or reviewed since May 2000, along with contract information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>IFSP-IDEA Part C</b> (Include a statement of the specific early intervention services necessary to meet the unique needs of the infant or toddler and the family to achieve the outcomes)	123.5	<p><b>Oakland USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews);</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures;</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to completing IFSPs (contents, process and participants), including both annual and periodic reviews);</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students, birth to three years of age, who have had an IFSP developed or reviewed since May 2000, along with contract information for the child's family, both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of evidence required 9/30/00</p> <p>CDE review of evidence required 11/1/00 that may include parent surveys</p>	Noncompliant 4/20-21/00
<b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs</b>		<p><b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b></p> <p>See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements</p> <p>See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15)</p>	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99, 4/20- 21/00 & 6/12/00

Reevaluation Related Services OT PT SLH Counseling Other Transition		and CASEMIS requirements -0- Noncompliant Findings	None required	Noncompliant 12/1/99, 4/20- 21/00 & 6/12/00
Supplementary Aids & Services		-0- Noncompliant Findings	None required	Compliant 5/8/00 & 6/19/00 same as above
Students-long term suspension expulsions		-0- Noncompliant Findings	None required	same as above
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b> </div>				

CDE-SED, 515 E Street, Room 276, Sacramento, CA. 95814  
 FAX: 916/327-5554 Address: CDE-SED, 515 E Street, Room 276, Sacramento, CA. 95814

### **QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<u><i>QAP Findings</i></u>	<u><i>Date(s)</i></u>	<u><i>Current Status</i></u>	<u><i>Required Corrective Actions</i></u>	<u><i>Date(s)</i></u>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-0-NC Identified	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1994	Compliant	None-1 NC Resolved	1994
<b>CCR</b>	1999	Noncompliant	6 NC Identified	1999
<b>(Self Review)</b>			CDE Compliance Agreement	Due 6/30/00
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	10 NC Resolved, 5 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

### **CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Conducted by CDE on March 23 & April 12, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;
  - related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);



- FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s) 3/23 &amp; 4/12/00</b>
4.0	The records demonstrate that parents are not consistently provided with a written notice of referral indicating that their child is being considered for special education.	
5.0	The records indicate that parents are not given an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all the necessary components.	
7.0	The records reveal that all students evaluated for initiate and three-year reviews do not consistently have recent vision and hearing screenings.	
9.0	The records indicate that IEPs are not consistently developed fifty days following written consent.	
12.2	Written assessment reports do not consistently include a statement regarding the validity of the evaluation.	
12.8	Review of assessment reports demonstrate a lack of documented evidence that the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were considered.	
15.0	Three year evaluations are not consistently occurring within 3 years.	
20.1	IEPs reviewed did not consistently contain a statement of how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum.	
20.3	IEPs reviewed did not demonstrate a direct relationship between the present levels of performance, evaluation results, and services provided.	

- 20.11 IEPs did not consistently specify the location of services. Some IEPs reviewed failed to address frequency and duration as well.
- 21.2 IEP goals did not consistently contain benchmarks (short term objectives) and when present, benchmarks did not consistently reflect the child's needs resulting from the disability that will enable the child to be involved in and progress in the general education program.
- 24.0 IEPs are not consistently reviewed within a year.
- 24.1 IEPs did not consistently contain documentation of the review of progress towards meeting annual goals.
- 29.2 IEPs did not demonstrate the participation of a general education teacher if the child is in or may be participating in general education.
- 29.2.1 Same as above
- 29.8 Transition IEPs did not consistently document the participation of the student.
- 45.2 For students identified as learning disabled, the IEPs did not consistently document the observation of relevant behavior of the student made by a team member other than the child's teacher.
- 45.3 For students identified as learning disabled, the IEPs did not consistently contain documentation indicating a severe discrepancy between ability and achievement.
- 77.0 There is inconsistent documentation regarding prior written notice.
- 78.1 Notice did not consistently contain all required information including actions proposed.
- 78.2 Notice did not consistently contain all required information including a description of the action proposed or refused.
- 78.3 Notice did not consistently contain all required information including a description of any other options that the agency considered and the reasons why those options were rejected.
- 78.4 Notice did not consistently contain all required information including a description of each evaluation procedures, test, record or report the district used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.

**Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Item Findings**

**Date(s)**3/23 & 4/12/00

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are no reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. CCR self-review findings were found compliant by CDE as of 3/17/00.

However, timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99 and district self-report. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

**Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s)**4/12/00-6/26/00

**METHOD OF REVIEW**

Ten student records were requested by CDE for review regarding implementation of the IEP. Ten student records were extensively reviewed for IEP verification that examined implementation of related services, supplementary aids and services, suspension/expulsion, FAPE and LRE. The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- IEP review
- Review of service logs and time sheets
- Student and staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents
- In person interviews with administrators, students and service providers

**FINDINGS**

For the random sample of students selected for this section of the verification review, no noncompliant findings were evident. Students were receiving services as stated on their IEPs. However, this data is compared to Sacramento City Unified School District's report on student level data that demonstrates noncompliance for students not receiving needed services. Specific corrective actions are required by CDE regarding implementing the IEP.

**CONCLUSION**

Noncompliant findings were reported by the district with data submitted to CDE as required. (See below)

**Sacramento City Unified School District**  
**Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

<b>Compliance Area for Students:</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance</b>
<b>Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)</b>	228	Take action to ensure that all currently completed evaluations are transmitted to district office for recording into data base (See attachment A: Student names, parent names, telephone numbers)
<b>Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years</b>	67	Identify cases in need of IEPS and schedule as soon as possible Improve monitoring system to maintain compliance (See attachment B: Student names, parent names, telephone numbers)
<b>Not receiving needed transition services</b>	32	ITPs will be requested for these students All teachers will receive memo outline ITP requirements (See attachment C: Student names, parent names, telephone numbers)
<b>Not receiving needed related services</b>		Individual follow up for Fall services. Continue restructuring of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with County Mental Health. (See attachment D & E: CDE Student Level Data including Student names, parent names, telephone numbers)
<b>Occupational therapy</b>	8	The district will: Establish clearer communications with Easter Seals pertaining to service expectations in relation to IEPS Will begin to utilize other NPAs in lieu of Easter Seals Will implement an aggressive recruitment program to identify possible OT providers willing to go through the NPA certification program. District submitted student names, parent names, telephone numbers to CDE.
<b>Physical therapy</b>	0	
<b>Speech and language therapy</b>	0	
<b>Counseling Other(s)</b>	13	
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled</b>	0	
<b>Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services</b>	1	Attachment F: After several attempts on the district's part to secure nursing services from both NPAs and other local healthcare agencies, the family requested that (student) remain on home instruction for the remainder of the 99/00 school year. The family will be working with (student) physician for clearance for (student) to attend school on a full-day

		<p>schedule beginning in September. The district will continue in its attempt to secure nursing services to begin the first day of school. Local NPAs will be contacted first. If no services are available from them, contact will be made with pediatric nursing agencies in the area.</p> <p>District submitted student name, parent names, telephone number to CDE.</p>
--	--	---

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Minimal Noncompliance**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines  <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines  <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
<b>Sacramento City USD</b>	6, 058	5, 881	177	2.9%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Non compliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines  <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
<b>Sacramento City USD</b>	6, 058	5, 704	354	5.8%

## Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

### SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

**June 30, 2000**

<b>QAP</b>	<b>Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE</b>	<b>Additional CDE Activities and Dates</b>	<b>Current Status &amp; Date</b>
<b>Local Plan</b>	None required	None required	Compliant 6/97
<b>CCR Validation reviews</b>	None required – 1992, -0- NC Identified, 1994-1 NC Resolved	None required	Compliant 1992, 1994
<b>CCR Self Review</b>	1999 –6 NC CDE Compliance Agreement due to CDE 6/30/00	1999 6 NC CDE follow up Monitor 6/30/00	Noncompliant 1999-6/30/00
<b>Compliance Complaints</b>	(as of 6/30/00) 10 NC Resolved, 5 Open	Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
<b>CASEMIS Data Reevaluation</b>	<b>Reevaluations</b> 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students	1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4. Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance	Noncompliant 12/1/99

			identified.	
<b>CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b> Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students		6/15/00 Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
<b>Verification Review- Student Records &amp; Topic</b>	<b>Item #</b>	<b>Verification Review –Student Records :</b>		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide written notice to parents that child is being considered for special education referral)	4.0	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to provision of a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral.</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide evaluation plan to parents within 15 days of referral)	5.0	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all required components.</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district’s policies and procedures; and</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents.</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child’s family-both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance.	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct hearing and vision screening)	7.0	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has: 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to vision and hearing screening.</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education, along with contact information for the child’s family-both address and telephone number.</p> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Identification</b>	9.0	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it</b>	CDE review of	Noncompliant

<b>&amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct IEP within 50 days of written consent)		<b>has :</b> <b>9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation plan 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation. 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding timelines for completing IEPs 3. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include statement of validity)	12.2	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <b>9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom)	12.4	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <b>9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include determination of the effects of environmental cultural or	12.8	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <b>9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to written evaluation reports 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00



economic disadvantage)		<p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>		
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation)	15.0	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of child's present levels of performance including how the disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general curriculum)	20.1	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include the direct relationship between present levels of performance, any evaluation and the education services to be provided and goals and benchmarks)	20.3	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00

<p><b>IEP</b> (Include the anticipated frequency, duration and location of recommended services and modifications)</p>	<p>20.10</p>	<p>initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/23 &amp; 4/12/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include benchmarks that reflect the child's needs resulting from the disability that will enable child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)</p>	<p>21.2</p>	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/23 &amp; 4/12/00</p>
<p><b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual review )</p>	<p>24.0</p>	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	<p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 3/23 &amp; 4/12/00</p>

<b>IEP</b> (Review progress toward previous annual goals and benchmarks and in the general curriculum when developing new goals & benchmarks)	24.1	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></span> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. <span style="float: right;">11/1/00</span>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher) & <b>IEP</b> (General education teacher participates in the development of the IEP)	29.2 29.2.1	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></span> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. <span style="float: right;">11/1/00</span>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include the child when appropriate or when IEPs meetings will be considering post secondary transition)	29.8	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></span> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP meetings that included discussion of post secondary transitions since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. <span style="float: right;">11/1/00</span>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents and students to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled,	45.2	<b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>9/30/00</b></span> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and	CDE review of policies and	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00

Include observations in an appropriate setting by a team member other than child's teacher )		<p>eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to evaluation and eligibility determination for student with specific learning disabilities</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	
<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, document the existence of a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and academic achievement in oral and written language, reading, or mathematics which cannot be corrected through regular or categorical services)	45.4	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to evaluation and eligibility determination for student with specific learning disabilities</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
<b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Written Notice Requirements & <b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Provide prior written notice including description of action proposed or refused; an explanation of why the district proposes or refused to take the action); a description of any other options that they district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected;)	77	<p><b>Sacramento City USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents</p> <p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</p> <p>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to provision of prior written notice to parents</p> <p>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 3/23 & 4/12/00
	78.1 78.2 78.3 78.4			

<b>Verification Review-Annual IEPs</b>		<b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b> See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements	See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS	Noncompliant 12/1/99, 3/28,4/12/00 & 6/12/00
<b>Reevaluation</b>				Noncompliant 12/1/99, 3/28, 4/12/00 & 6/12/00
<b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other		<b>Related Services: Occupation Therapy, Counseling, Supplemental Aids and Services, Transition Services</b>		
		<b>Corrective Actions: Sacramento City USD</b> will provide CDE an updated status for OT and counseling services for students not receiving services as reported June 12, 2000 to CDE. The updated status will include student name, Service Provider name and phone number, current status of services (i.e. service provided) and any actions the district is taking to come into compliance or maintain compliance regarding these services. <b>Provide to CDE by 1/1/00</b>	CDE review of required evidence which may include follow up parent interviews	Noncompliant OT, Counseling, Supplemental aids and services 6/12/00
<b>Transition</b>				
<b>Supplementary Aids &amp; Services</b>		See above	CDE review of required evidence which may include follow up parent interviews	Noncompliant 6/12/00
<b>Students-long term suspension expulsions</b>		-0- Noncompliance Identified	None required	Compliant 6/12/00

**CDE Monitor: Margo Dronek-Pacey, Consultant Telephone: 916/327-3531 email:**

**[gpacey@cde.ca.gov](mailto:gpacey@cde.ca.gov) FAX: 916/327-3534 Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

<p align="center"><b>District Compliance Profile</b>  <b>COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b></p>
--

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FINDINGS**

<i><b><u>QAP Findings</u></b></i>	<i><b><u>Date(s)</u></b></i>	<i><b><u>Current Status</u></b></i>	<i><b><u>Required Corrective Actions</u></b></i>	<i><b><u>Date(s)</u></b></i>
<b>Local Plan:</b>	6/97	Compliant	None	6/97
<b>CCR:</b>	1992	Compliant	None-7 NC Resolved	1992
<b>CCR:</b>	1994	Noncompliant	11 NC Resolved, 4 NC CDE Compliance Agreement	Due 6/30/00
<b>CCR:</b>	1998	Noncompliant	33 NC Resolved, 2 NC CDE Compliance Agreement	5/4/00 Due 6/30/00
<b>CCR (Self Review)</b>	Not due			
<b>Complaints</b>	97/98 to present	Noncompliant	8 NC Resolved, 6 Open	6/30/00
<b>Due Process</b>	1999	-0-Decisions/Orders		1999

**CDE VERIFICATION REVIEW PROCESS**  
**Conducted by CDE on May 30, June 1, 2000**

**For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides: a detailed summary of noncompliant findings, corrective actions (including activities and timelines); detailed summary of any and all prior findings of noncompliance; current status of corrective actions and of compliance; compliance status of whether children are receiving needed services (including any evidence from parents that corrective actions have occurred) and specific CDE actions has taken or will take to secure compliance including dates and enforcement/sanction actions, as appropriate, regarding the district's:**

- Compliance/noncompliance regarding IDEA Part B in general;
- Implementation of the IEP including:
  - transition services;

- related services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech and language therapy, counseling, other(s);
  - FAPE: students receiving services while under a long term suspension 10 days or more or expelled;
  - LRE: students receiving supplementary aids and services in the least restrictive environment
- Verification of the district's ability or lack of ability to maintain compliance in previously identified areas of noncompliance

### **Verification of Compliance with IDEA, Part B**

(Review included: student age appropriate record reviews (infant, preschool, elementary, secondary) and supplemental record reviews (suspension/expulsion, transition, interim placement, low incidence, behavior intervention plans, African American requirements, nonpublic school)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Date(s)</b> 5/30 & 6/1/00
3.0	Record review indicates that documenting classroom modifications conducted prior to special education referral.	
4.0	Review of records indicates that documenting assessment procedures such as: written notices to parents informing them that their child is being considered for special education; documenting that parents were provided with an assessment plan which includes the reason for assessment; type of assessment and person conducting the assessment and, documenting that assessments include consideration of parental information; IQ tests that are not in violation of state law and conducted within legal timelines.	
5.0	In addition to item 4.0 above, the district does not provide parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains the required components.	
7.0	A review of records indicates the need to document vision and hearing screening as part of the initial and three-year evaluations.	
8.7	A review of records reveals that documenting assessment procedures do not document consideration of information and private evaluations by the parent.	
9.0	A review a records reveals that signed individual evaluation plans do not result in an IEP within 50 days of obtaining written parental consent.	
10.0	A review of records indicates that the evaluation does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.	

- 12.2 The evaluation does not contain a statement regarding validity of the evaluation
- 12.3 The evaluation does not include findings whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used.
- 12.4 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.
- 12.6 A review of records indicates that the evaluation report does not include information regarding relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting.
- 12.8 Evaluation reports do not include findings regarding determination of the environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
- 15.0 LEA does not conduct three year reevaluations on or before the calendar date that is three years from the initial IEP meeting (or previous triennial).
- 20.5 Student's IEPs do not include a description of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child to participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.6 child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities.
- 20.7 Students IEPs do not include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed by such means as period report cards at least as often as are parents of nondisabled children regarding their child's progress toward annual goals.
- 20.12 Beginning at least one year before the student reaches the age of 18, the students IEPs do not state that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turning 18.
- 24.0 The IEP team does not periodically review but, not less than annually, the student's IEP. (CASEMIS and LEA self-report)
- 24.1 The IEP team does not review the progress toward previous annual goals, benchmarks (or short term objectives) and in the general curriculum when developing new goals, benchmarks (short term objectives).
- 25.0 An IEP team meeting is not held within 30 days of receipt of a written request from a parent.



- 29.3 A review of records indicates that an absence of a general education teacher, student, or other required participants at IEP meetings.
- 33.1 A review of records indicates that documenting present levels of performance, development of measurable goals and benchmarks, and, indicating classroom modifications necessary for the student to progress in the general program. The IEP team does not include a description of activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education program indicating the nature of each activity, and the time spent on the activity each day or week.
- 33.2 A review of records indicates that a description of the activities provided to support the transition of pupils from the special education program into the regular education program.
- 45.1 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing that the disability is not the result of visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance.
- 45.2 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing the observations of relevant behavior of the student that have been made by one team member other than the child's teacher (in the regular classroom or other appropriate environment).
- 45.4 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing the relationship of that behavior to the student's academic functioning.
- 45.6 For students determined to have a specific learning disability, the IEP team does not certify in writing any educationally relevant medical findings.
- 78.1 The district notification does not contain a description of action propose or refused.
- 78.3 The district's notification does not provide a description of any other option the agency considered and the reason why those options were rejected.

### **Areas of Reoccurring Noncompliance Based on Prior Noncompliance History**

(Review included: Data analysis of all QAP, information, interviews with district administration and others with varying compliance tests and evidence gathering to determine compliance maintenance of prior noncompliant areas)

**Item Findings**

**Date(s) 5/30 & 6/1/00**

Review of prior CDE Coordinated Compliance Review Validation Review (CCR) findings, CCR 1999 Self Review findings, compliance complaints, due process history, interviews with district administration and analysis of the current verification review process findings indicate that there are reoccurring areas of noncompliance previously identified. CCR self-review findings were found compliant by CDE as of 3/17/00. The verification review reflects past noncompliance and not the compliant changes in progress.

CDE has worked extensively with Compton USD and continues to do so. The verification review reflected areas previously identified and in process of correction by the district. From the early 1990's, Compton USD has had 62 systemic areas of noncompliance that needed correction. In 1999-2000, CDE worked closely with the district who provided evidence of correction for 56 of the identified 62 systemic areas. The remaining areas are in the correction process with evidence provided to CDE by June 30, 2000. This current Corrective Action Plan is being reviewed, discussed and revised at the time of this report. CDE is working with the district to establish and maintain systematic ways to come into compliance and maintain compliance. CDE provides continuous monitoring and technical assistance to ensure continuous progress in meeting and maintaining compliance.

Timely annual reviews and three year reevaluations are noncompliant based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99 and district self-report. These were previously identified as noncompliant in former CCR validation reviews. CDE will continue its monitoring efforts as stated in the Corrective Action Plan.

### **Implementation of the IEP- Verification Process**

(Review included: review of students current IEPs and required services, interviews with parents to determine if student is receiving required service(s), interviews with administration/service providers as needed, collection and analysis of written evidence substantiating that students receive required services)

**Date(s) 5/30 & 6/1/00**

## **METHOD OF REVIEW**

Fourteen student records were extensively reviewed for verification of the implementation of IEPs (7 records Compton USD and 7 records Los Angeles County Office of Education, providers of service for Compton USD students). These records included students receiving services from Compton USD and the Los Angeles County Office of Education. These reviews looked at related services, supplementary aids and services (LRE) and suspension/expulsion, (students receiving services/FAPE). The following activities were conducted to aid in the compliance review:

- Review of student IEPs
- Review of service logs and staff time sheets
- Student/staff observations
- Telephone interviews with parents
- In person interviews with administrators, students and service providers

- Review of policies and procedures
- School district calendar

## FINDINGS

1. As demonstrated by the CASEMIS review of the verification review process, Compton USD had substantial difficulty in providing or locating student records. Many student files were missing.
2. For one student, an IEP was not current. This noncompliance is addressed in item 24 (annual reviews) and CDE CASEMIS activities in the Corrective Action Plan.
3. For the selected student reviewed and as determined by the various methods undertaken, students are receiving special education and services as stated on their IEPs.

## CONCLUSION

From the sample reviewed and methods applied, the selected students IEPs were implemented as written providing documentation that students are receiving services.

For IEP implementation: -0- Noncompliant findings

### **Compton Unified School District** **Implementation of the IEP – District Submitted Student Level Data**

Provided to CDE by June 12, 2000

Compliance Area for Students:	Number of Students	District Actions for Correction of Noncompliance
Without current IEPs (past due annual IEPs)	340	Memo to individual principals with copies to their supervisors Plan to work July and August Student names, parent names and phone numbers to CDE 6/12/00 (SEMIS/SASI report)
Not receiving a reevaluation within 3 years	138	Memos/coaching individual psychologists Create teams to “clean up” Plan to work July and August Student names, parent names and phone numbers to CDE 6/12/00 (SEMIS/SASI report)
Not receiving needed transition services	0	
Not receiving needed related services  Occupational therapy Physical therapy Speech and language therapy Counseling Other(s)	0	
Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while under a long term suspension (10 days or more)	0	

Not receiving services pursuant to an IEP while expelled	0	
Not receiving services in the least restrictive environment with needed supplementary aids and services	0	

**CDE CASEMIS DATA: Reevaluations, Annual IEPs**

**Three year (3) Reevaluation Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Reevaluation within timelines <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Reevaluation within timelines <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely reevaluations
Compton USD	2, 701	2, 427	274	10.1%

**Annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) Timelines**

CDE Findings: District Data Submissions to CDE- Reevaluations and Annual IEPs  
Source: CASEMIS (California Special Education Management Information System)  
December, 1999 Pupil Count

**Findings: Noncompliant**

**Date(s)12/1/99**

District	Total Sp.Ed. Pupil Count	# Students receiving Annual IEPs within timelines <b>COMPLIANT</b>	# Students not receiving Annual IEPs within timelines <b>NONCOMPLIANT</b>	Percentage % Students not receiving timely annual reviews
Compton USD	2, 701	1, 949	752	27.8%

# Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

## COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

June 30, 2000

QAP	Corrective Actions Required and Due Date(s) to CDE		Additional CDE Activities and Dates	Current Status & Date
Local Plan	None required		None required	Compliant 6/97
CCR Validation reviews	None required - 1992all NC Resolved, 1994 –2 NC not resolved, 1998 3 NC not Resolved-CDE Continued Follow Up & Monitor through CDE Required Compliance Agreement 6/30/00		Monitor/Follow up to Required Compliance Agreement due 6/30/00	Compliant 1992, Noncompliant 1994, 1998 6/30/00
CCR Self Review	Not due		None required	NA
Compliance Complaints	(as of 6/30/00) 8 NC Resolved, 6 Open		Monitor and close for each NC allegation for all compliance cases. (ongoing)	Noncompliant 6/30/00
CASEMIS Data Reevaluation	Reevaluations 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct reevaluations for identified students		1. CDE letter to district requiring compliance. Dated 5/25/2000. 2. CDE review LEA 6/15/00 submission of correction and 6/30/00 Final Year Report data from LEA. Identify additional noncompliance 3. Analyze 12/1/00 LEA CASEMIS data for correction. 4.Implement CDE corrective actions including sanction process 12/1/00 if noncompliance identified.	Noncompliant 12/1/99
CASEMIS Data Annual Reviews	Annual Reviews 6/15/00 Review and correct data & Conduct annual reviews for identified students		Same as above	Noncompliant 12/1/99
Verification Review- Student Records & Topic	Item #	Verification Review –Student Records :  <i>CDE FMTA consultant met with Compton USD June 27-28, 2000 onsite to review all noncompliant findings including prior areas of noncompliance, if any, verification review findings for student records and IEP implementation. Corrective actions are in discussion at the time of this June 30, 2000 report and may change to address each and every area of identified noncompliance.</i>		

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Site staff to document attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral for special education)	3.0	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> <b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to documenting attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral to special education</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding documenting attempts to modify the general education program prior to referral to special education</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have considered for special education referral, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide written notice to parents that child is being considered for special education referral)	4.0	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> <b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to provision of a written notice to parents when their child is being considered for special education referral.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Provide evaluation plan to parents within 15 days of referral)	5.0	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> <b>9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to providing the parents with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all required components.</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff of the district's policies and procedures; and</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the parent with an evaluation plan within 15 days of the referral for evaluation that contains all of the required contents.</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have referred for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00

<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct hearing and vision screening)	7.0	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has:</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to conducting vision and hearing screening</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to vision and hearing screening.</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding vision and hearing screening policies and procedures</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Consideration of information and private evaluations provided by the parent)	8.7	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to consideration of information provided by the parent and private evaluations)</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to consideration of information provided by the parent and private evaluations</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding consideration of information provided by the parent and private evaluations</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Conduct IEP within 50 days of written consent	9.0	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation plan</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related completing an IEP within 50 days of obtaining parental consent to an evaluation.</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding timelines for completing IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number.</li> </ol> <p>11/1/00</p>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include information related to	10.0	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has :</b> 9/30/00</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to enabling the child to be</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00

enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum)		involved in and progress in the general curriculum. 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include statement of validity and whether tests are valid for the purpose for which they are used & <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Include whether student's needs can be met in the regular classroom) & <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Relevant behavior noted during observation of the student in an appropriate setting & <b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage)	12.2 12.3 12.4 12.6 12.8	This corrective action encompasses items 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.6, 12.8 listed left. <b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to all required components for written evaluation reports 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding these specific evaluation requirements 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have been evaluated for initial special education or who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<b>Identification &amp; Evaluation</b> (Three year reevaluation)	15.0	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal law related to preparing and conducting three year reevaluations and subsequent IEP meetings 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures for completing three year reevaluations and IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have become eligible for a three year reevaluation, along with contact	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00



<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of program modifications and support for school personnel that will be provided to the child to enable the child to progress in the general curriculum)</p>	20.5	<p>information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of supplementary aids and services as well as program modifications and supports for school personnel</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to provision of supplementary aids and services as well as program modifications and supports for school personnel</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities)</p>	20.6	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participating with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participating with nondisabled children in the regular class and extra curricular and nonacademic activities</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<p><b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed about their child's progress)</p>	20.7	<p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs</li> <li>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures</li> <li>3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to how and when parents will be informed regarding their child's progress and how that information will be recorded in IEPs</li> <li>4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become</li> </ol>	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00

<b>IEP</b> (Include a statement of whether the child will take district or statewide achievement tests)	20.8	eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00  <b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b>  1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to assessing the progress of students with disabilities using state or district-wide achievement tests, using alternate assessment methodologies and including information about progress assessment in the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include that the student has been informed of the IDEA rights that will transfer to the student upon turn 18 at least one year prior to turning age 18)	20.12	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b>  1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related the contents, process and participants for developing IEPs-including initial IEPs, annual reviews and triennial IEPs 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have turned 17 years of age and who have had an IEP meeting since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<b>IEP</b> (Conduct annual review )	24.0	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b>  1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00
<b>IEP</b> (Review progress toward previous annual goals and	24.1	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b>  1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state	CDE review of	Noncompliant 5/30 & 6/1/00

benchmarks and in the general curriculum when developing new goals & benchmarks)		and federal laws and regulations related to review of the IEP 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to review of the IEP 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP reviews, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	
<b>IEP</b> (Include general education teacher)	29.2	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to participation of general education teachers in the IEP meeting 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to participation of general education teachers in IEPs 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<b>IEP</b> (Include a description of activities provided to integrate the pupil into the regular education program indicating the nature of each activity and the time spent on the activity each day or week)	33.1 33.2	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to supporting the transition of students from special class or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to the general education classroom in the public school 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators regarding the policies and procedures related to supporting the transition of students from special class or centers, or from nonpublic, nonsectarian school to the general education classroom in the public school 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had IEP meetings that included discussion of post secondary transitions since May 2000, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00
<b>IEP</b> (For students identified as learning disabled, Include a statement that the disability is not the result of	45.1 45.2 45.3	<b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b> 1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to evaluation and eligibility determination for students with specific learning disabilities	CDE review of policies and procedures including possible	Noncompliant 5/30 &6/1/00

<p>visual, hearing, motor impairment, mental retardation or emotional disturbance); Include observations in an appropriate setting by a team member other than child's teacher; include relationship of that behavior to the student's academic functioning )</p> <p><b>Procedural Safeguards</b> (Provide prior written notice including description of action proposed or refused; an explanation of why the district proposes or refused to take the action); a description of any other options that they district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected;)</p>	<p>78.1 78.3</p>	<p>2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to evaluation and eligibility determination for student with specific learning disabilities 4. Provide CDE with a list of students identified as having specific learning disabilities, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p> <p><b>Compton USD must provide evidence that it has : 9/30/00</b></p> <p>1. Policies and procedures that are compliant with state and federal laws and regulations related to the provision of prior written notice to parents 2. Provided notification to administrators and staff regarding policies and procedures 3. Conducted inservice training for staff and administrators related to provision of prior written notice to parents 4. Provide CDE with a list of students who have had initial IEPs, annual reviews and who have become eligible for a three year reevaluations, along with contact information for the child's family-both address and telephone number. 11/1/00</p>	<p>survey of parents to ensure compliance</p> <p>CDE review of policies and procedures including possible survey of parents to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Noncompliant 5/30 &amp; 6/1/00</p>
<p><b>Verification Review- Annual IEPs Reevaluation</b></p> <p><b>Related Services</b> OT PT SLH Counseling Other Transition Supplementary Aids &amp; Services Students-long term suspension expulsions</p>		<p><b>Verification Review-IEP Implementation</b> See Correction Actions Required above (Item 24) and CASEMIS requirements See Corrective Actions Required above (Item 15) and CASEMIS requirements</p> <p>-0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified -0- Noncompliance identified</p>	<p>See CDE Activities Annual Review CASEMIS</p> <p>None required None required None required None required None required None required None required None required</p>	<p>Noncompliant 12/1/99 &amp; 6/12/00 Noncompliant 12/1/99 &amp; 6/12/00</p> <p>Compliant 5/30 &amp; 6/1/00 Same as above Same as above Same as above Same as above Same as above Same as above</p>

**CDE Monitor: Betty Carr, Consultant, Telephone: 916/322-9578 email: [bcarr@cde.ca.gov](mailto:bcarr@cde.ca.gov), FAX: 916/327-8878, Address: CDE-SED, 515 L Street, Room 270, Sacramento, CA. 95814**

**Summary Review of Selected Districts: Section C**  
**Agencies with Longstanding Noncompliance**  
**Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students with Disabilities**  
**Annual IEP Reviews and Three Year Reevaluations**

District	Annual IEP Reviews CASEMIS 12/1/99	District Self Report 6/12/00 Annual IEPs		3 Year Reevaluations CASEMIS 12/1/99	District Self Report 6/12/00 Reevaluations	
Santa Barbara Elementary School District	398	0		157	0	
Oakland USD	1131	281		694	110	
Sacramento City USD	354	228		177	67	
Compton USD	752	340		274	138	

**Summary Review of Selected Districts: Section C**  
**Agencies with Longstanding Noncompliance**  
**Data Demonstrating Positive Impact for Students with Disabilities: Related Services**

District	OT	PT	SLH	Counseling	Transition Services	Suspension 10 days +	Expulsion	Supplementary Aids & Services
Santa Barbara Elementary School District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland USD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sacramento City USD	8	0	0	13	32	0	0	1
Compton USD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## **D. CDE Will Take Effective Enforcement Actions To Ensure Compliance When Other Actions Have Not Ensured Compliance**

**1. CDE will provide a description of each enforcement action (including any of the sanction options listed on page 52 of CDE's December 21, 1999 submission to OSERS) that CDE has taken, since June 1, 1998, in any public agency in the State, including:**

- a. A specific description of the action taken;
- b. The date of the action; and
- c. The impact of the action, including, but not limited to, the status of any further corrective actions agreed to or required and the status of compliance.

### **CURRENT STATUS:**

For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides information to OSEP regarding enforcement/sanction actions taken by CDE for various LEAs from January 27, 2000-June 30, 2000. The data provided includes compliance complaint #, date of CDE final report sent to the LEA, and the required enforcement/sanction (compensatory education, reimbursement, local school board hearings, civil action, fiscal withholding, offer of technical assistance, and outcome of CDE effectiveness).

### **WRIT of MANDATE SANCTION**

On April 21, 2000, CDE legal office filed a Writ of Mandate in a competent court of jurisdiction in San Diego County regarding Compliance Complaint I-0044-98/99 to compel compliance through an appropriate court order. This interagency compliance case involves the San Diego Unified School District, San Diego County Office of Education and the San Diego County Department of Mental Health to identify and serve various pupils with disabilities who are incarcerated in Juvenile Hall and lack a coordination among the agencies. Seven pupils were identified in the complaint. Twelve (12) allegations were stated in the complainant letter. Eleven (11) of the 12 allegations were found noncompliant.

Student specific corrective actions were due prior to March 15, 1999 and procedural actions, including the development of an Interagency Agreement, were due prior to June 15, 1999. A request for reconsideration was reviewed in April 1999 by CDE and the corrective actions remain in place. The San Diego County Office of Education has completed the student specific corrective actions.

Throughout the months of January 1999 through April 12, 2000, CDE staff has provided continuous efforts to work with and obtain required corrective action by San Diego City Unified School District. These efforts to assist the district have not resulted in compliance therefore CDE filing a Writ of Mandate on April 21, 2000.

### **CURRENT STATUS**

As of this June 30, 2000 report, San Diego City Unified School District has agreed to stipulate to judgement. CDE legal is waiting for the signed documentation from the district for CDE to file. The district appears to have completed all corrective actions but one. CDE Complaints Management and Mediation consultant staff are in ongoing contact with the district director of special education to stay apprised of progress with this one remaining student.

***CDE STATEWIDE COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT: THREE YEAR REEVALUATIONS AND ANNUAL INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS***

For this June 30, 2000 report, CDE provides information regarding enforcement and possible sanction procedures regarding noncompliance for three year reevaluations and annual Individualized Education Program reviews.

On May 25, 2000, CDE mailed 430 letters to local school districts regarding their status of compliance/noncompliance with timely annual IEP reviews and timely Reevaluations based on CASEMIS data of 12/1/99. Four types of letters were mailed with student lists of identified students sent in a second mailing specifically identifying each student with data indicating noncompliance.

**Letter 1:** Letter indicates significant noncompliance. Districts are to remedy (provide annual IEPs, reevaluations) by June 15, 2000 and provide evidence to CDE of the correction. If compliance is not rectified, CDE will begin the sanctioning process June 30, 2000.

**Letter 2:** Letter indicates that CDE will reconcile districts' data in the CDE June 30, 2000 LEA data submission to compare with the 12/1/99 LEA data submission. If compliance is not rectified, CDE will begin sanctions September 1, 2000.

**Letter 3:** Letter indicates that CDE will monitor districts' June 30, 2000 submission of data regarding annual IEPs and reevaluations. If noncompliance noted, CDE will draw this information to districts' attention for correction by September 1, 2000.

**Letter 4:** Letter indicates that CDE commends the district for compliance or noted compliance improvement.

As of the June 30, 2000 report, CDE is preparing to mail a third letter to the 430 districts..

In summary, the letter states that CDE will:

1. Continue to monitor districts continued progress toward completing reevaluations and annual reviews identified through the December 1, 1999 pupil count. The June 30, 2000 End of Year data files will be reviewed to assess completion of reevaluations and annual IEP reviews found incomplete as of December 1, 1999 pupil count.

2. Identify any additional instances of noncompliance through CDE review of the June 30, 2000 End of Year data files in which annual IEP reviews and/or three year reevaluations were not completed within the required timelines. CDE expects that the these additional cases will be resolved without delay and that districts take steps to prevent additional lapses in the required timelines for reevaluation and annual IEP reviews.
3. CDE will assess progress toward full compliance through analysis of the districts December 1, 2000 pupil count. It is expected that the data will demonstrate that all reevaluations and annual IEPs will be completed for students who were due for them and that all reevaluations and annual IEP reviews initiated after July 1, 2000 were completed on time.

CDE told districts that if they are unable to meet these targets, specific corrective action plans would be developed and the sanction process would begin. Districts were encouraged to work with their SELPA director and other districts who serve their children to ensure timely reevaluations and annual IEP reviews.

The following table provides an update of compliance corrective actions include outcomes and other enforcement/sanction procedures taken by CDE from January 2000 to June 30, 2000.

### CDE Enforcement/Sanction Actions Update January 2000 to June 30, 2000

District	Case #	Final Report Date	Comp. Ed.	Reimb	Local School Board Hearing	Civil Action	Fiscal Withhold	TA Offered	Outcome
LAUSD	S-0214-99/00	2/2/00	X					X	Resolved-FMTA C 2/2/00
Santa Clara Co. Schools	S-0287-99/00	1/28/00	X						Reconsideration granted by CDE general counsel. Withdrawal of required corrective actions 3/22/00 FMTA N
Long Beach USD	S-0311-99/00	1/28/00	X						Open FMTA C
Mt. Diablo USD	S-0332-99/00	1/30/00	X					X	Resolved 4/17/00 FMTA N
Alameda City USD	S-0339-99/00	2/12/00	X					X	Pending: Complainant & district agree to deferring services (student need) FMTA N
Santa Monica-Malibu USD	S-0379-99/00	2/16/00	X					X	Open FMTA C
Scotts Valley USD	S-0265-99/00	2/10/00		X					Open FMTA N Additional evidence needed



Santa Cruz City High	S-0310-99/00	2/5/00		X					Resolved FMTA N 4/10/00
Beverly Hills USD	S-0329-99/00	2/11/00		X					Open FMTA C
Acton-Agua Dulce USD	S-0350-99/00	2/20/00		X					Open FMTA C
Petaluma USD	S-0328-99/00	2/1/00			X			X	Closed FMTA C
Long Beach USD	S-0198-99/00	11/10/99			X				Open FMTA C
Sacramento City USD	S-0333-99/00	2/22/00			X				Open FMTA N
Sweetwater and SDCOE	S-0363-99/00	2/22/00			X				Resolved FMTA S 5/3/00
Carlsbad USD	S-0412-99/00	2/24/00			X				Open FMTA S
Carlsbad USD	S-0393-99/00	2/23/00			X				Due process-Mediation FMTA S
Moreno Valley USD	S-0722-98/99	2/25/00			X			X	Resolved FMTA S 3/29/00
Vista USD	S-0414-99/00	3/2/00			X				Closed per mediation agreement FMTA S 4/7/00
San Diego USD:NEW	I- 0044-98/99					X Writ		X	4/12 ltr. to Supt., 4/21 Writ of Mandate filed by CDE legal
S. Lake Tahoe USD	S-0252-99/00	1/14/00			X			X	WRIT if services not provided. LEA to provide Services. CDE long term follow up of FAPE.
Saddleback Valley	S-0251-99/00	1/3/00			X				Closed FMTA S
San Jose USD	S0254-99/00	2/11/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Klamath Trinity Joint	S-0264-99/00	1/11/00			X				Open FMTA N
Paradise USD	S-0268-99/00	1/4/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Paradise USD	S-0274-99/00	1/3/00			X				Closed FMTA N
San Diego City USD	S-0276-99/00	1/10/00			X				Closed FMTA S
Cajon Valley Union Elem.	S-0278-99/00	1/12/00			X				Closed FMA S
Mt. Diablo USD	S-0282-99/00	1/10/00			X				Open FMTA N
Inaglewood USD	S-0284-99/00	1/28/00			X				Open FMTA C
Centinella Valley Union HSD	S-0285-99/00	1/14/00			X				Open FMTA C
Santa Clara Co. Schools	S-0287-99/00	1/28/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Mt. Diablo USD	S-0298-99/00	1/26/00			X				Open FMTA N
Adelanto Elementary	S-0301-99/00	1/6/00			X				Due Process FMTA S
Long Beach USD	S-0311-99/00	1/28/00			X				Open FMTA C
Ravenswood City Elem.	S-0322-99/00	2/4/00			X				Open FMTA N

Petaluma City Elem.	S-0328-99/00	2/1/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Mt. Diablo USD	S-0332-99/00	3/10/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Sacramento City USD	S-0333-99/00	2/18/00			X				Open FMTA N
Alameda City USD	S-0339-99/00	1/28/00			X				Open FMA N
Novato USD	S-0345-99/00	2/18/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Acton-Agua Dulce	S-0350-99/00	2/2/00			X				Open FMTA C
Norwalk La Mirada	S-0437-99/00	3/22/00			X				Open FMTA C
Long Beach USD	S-0389-99/00	2/16/00			X				Open FMTA C
Sweetwater Union	S-0363-99/00	2/18/00			X				Closed FMTA S
Oakland USD	S-0355-99/00	2/18/00			X				Open FMTA N
Santa Monica Malibu USD	S-0364-99/00	2/2/00			X				Open FMTA C
Santa Monica Malibu USD	S-0379-99/00	2/16/00			X				Open FMTA C
Long Beach USD	S-0389-99/00	3/22/00			X				Open FMTA C
Pittsburg USD	S-0392-99/00	3/3/00			X				Open FMTA N
Carlsbad USD	S-0393-99/00	2/23/00			X				Due Process-Mediation FMTA S
Sequoia Union HSD	S-0410-99/00	3/3/00			X				Open FMTA N
Carlsbad USD	S-0412-99/00	2/24/00			X				Open FMTA S
Vista USD	S-0414-99/00	3/2/00			X				Closed –due process – mediation FMTA S
San Francisco USD	S-0418-99/00	3/24/00			X				Open FMTA N
San Jose USD	S-0422-99/00	3/24/00			X				Open FMTA N
San Ramon Valley	S-0426-99/00	2/25/00			X				Closed FMTA N
Los Angeles USD	S-0427-99/00	3/29/00			X				Open FMTA C
Cabrillo USD	S-0428-99/00	4/6/00			X				Closed FMTA N
San Francisco USD	S-0432-99/00	3/28/00			X				Open FMTA N
Mt. Diablo USD	S-0440-99/00	3/28/00			X				Open FMTA N
Whittier City Elem.	S-0451-99/00	4/4/00			X				Open FMTA C
Capistrano USD	S-0472-99/00	4/3/00			X				Due process-hearing FMTA S
New Haven USD	I-0513-99/00	4/25/00			X				Open FMTA N
Moorpark USD	S-0626-99/00	5/22/00			X				Open FMTA C
Ventura USD	S-0593-99/00	5/30/00			X				Open FMTA C
San Diego City USD	S-0596-99/00	6/3/00			X				Open FMTA S

<b>Apple Valley USD</b>	<b>S-0597-99/00</b>	<b>5/30/00</b>							<b>Open FMA S</b>
<b>San Dieguito Union HSD</b>	<b>S-0598-99/00</b>	<b>5/30/00</b>			<b>X</b>				<b>Open FMTA S</b>
<b>Burbank USD</b>	<b>S-0624-99/00</b>	<b>6/6/00</b>	<b>X</b>						<b>Open FMTA C</b>
<b>Mt. Diablo USD</b>	<b>S-0625-99/00</b>	<b>6/6/00</b>	<b>X</b>						<b>Open FMTA N</b>
<b>San Diego City USD</b>	<b>S-0571-99/00</b>	<b>5/12/00</b>			<b>X</b>				<b>Open FMTA S</b>
<b>Pomona USD</b>	<b>S-0576-99/00</b>	<b>5/22/00</b>			<b>X</b>				<b>Open FMTA C</b>
<b>San Diego City USD</b>	<b>S-0580-99/00</b>	<b>5/27/00</b>			<b>X</b>				<b>Open FMTA S</b>
<b>San Diego City USD</b>	<b>S-0581-99/00</b>	<b>5/27/00</b>			<b>X</b>				<b>Open FMTA S</b>
<b>Moorpark USD</b>	<b>S-0626-99/00</b>	<b>6/6/00</b>			<b>X</b>				<b>Open FMTA C</b>